DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 474 CE 039 924

TITLE Hearing on Adult Education. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Ninety-Eighth Congress, Second Session.

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on Education and Labor.

PUB DATE 22 Mar 84

NOTE 55p.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; *Adult Literacy; Adult Programs; *Basic Skills; Educational Legislation; *Federal Legislation; Hearings; *Illiteracy; *State Programs

IDENTIFIERS *Adult Education Act 1966; Congress 98th

ABSTRACT

This is a congressional hearing on H.R. 11, a bill to extend several expiring education programs. The focus is on the Adult Education Act, a program that provides grants to states to help provide basic skills to illiterate adults and adults without a high school diploma. The text of H.R. 11 is provided. Testimony includes statements, prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc., from individuals representing the National Advisory Council on Adult Education; Division of Educational Services, Ohio Department of Education; Illinois State Superintendent of Public Instruction; State of Kentucky; and the American Library Association. (YLB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

# HEARING ON ADULT EDUCATION

CE

ED250474

# HEARING

BEFORE THE

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

## H.R. 11

TO EXTEND THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 1989 THE AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR CERTAIN EDUCATION PROGRAMS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, ON MARCH 22, 1984

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

35-872 O

WASHINGTON : 1984

CE039924

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
RAY KOGOVSEK, Colorado
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
FRANK HARRISON, Pennsylvania
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
DENNIS E. ECKART, Ohio
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota

JOHN N. ERLENBORN, Illinois
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
RON PACKARD, California
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

---

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
IKE ANDREWS, North Carolina
GEORGE MILLER, California
BALTASAR CORRADA, Puerto Rico
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
FREDERICK C. BOUCHER, Virginia
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
SALA BURTON, California
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
RON PACKARD, California
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
HOWARD C. NIELSON, Utah
ROD CHANDLER, Washington,
(Ex Officio)
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Hearing held in Washington, DC, on March 22, 1984 | 1 |
| Text of H.R. 11 | 2 |
| Statement of: | |
| Dorsey, Patric, council member, accompanied by Richard Ventura, executive director, National Advisory Council on Adult Education | 31 |
| Miller, James W., director, Division of Educaticnal Services, Ohio Department of Education | 11 |
| Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, etc.: | |
| Dorsey, Patric, National Advisory Council on Adult Education, prepared statement of | 14 |
| Gill, Donald G., Illinois State Superintendent of Education, prepared statement of | 48 |
| McDonald, Alice, superintendent of public instruction, State of Kentucky, prepared statement of | 45 |
| Miller, James W., director, Division of Educational Services, Ohio Department of Education: | |
| Adult Basic Education, State of Ohio | 10 |
| Annual Report Highlights, fiscal year 1983 (table) | 10 |
| Economic and Employment Impact Data (table) | 11 |
| Prepared statement of | 7 |
| Total enrollment (table) | 9 |
| Wedgeworth, Robert, executive director, American Library Association, Chicago, IL, prepared statement of | 49 |

# HEARING ON ADULT EDUCATION

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1984

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:40 a.m., in room 2261, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Members present: Representatives Perkins, Andrews, Hayes, Goodling, Gunderson, and Nielson.

Staff present: John F. Jennings, counsel; Nancy L. Kober, legislative specialist; Electra Beahler, Republican education counsel; and Richard DiEugenio, Republican senior legislative associate.

Chairman PERKINS. This morning the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education is continuing hearings on H.R. 11, a bill to extend several expiring education programs. Today we will focus on the Adult Education Act.

The Adult Education Act, first enacted in 1966, was most recently amended in 1978. This program provides grants to States to help provide basic skills to illiterate adults and adults without a high school diploma.

98TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

# H. R. 11

To extend through fiscal year 1989 the authorization of appropriations for certain education programs, and for other purposes.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 3, 1983

Mr. PERKINS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor

---

# A BILL

To extend through fiscal year 1989 the authorization of appropriations for certain education programs, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

ADULT EDUCATION

SECTION 1. (a) Section 311(b) of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1208a(b)) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(b) Section 313(b) of such Act is amended by striking out October 1, 1984" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1990".

(c) Section 315(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "for fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1989".

(d) Section 316(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(e) Section 318(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "four" and inserting in lieu thereof "nine".

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

SEC. 2. (a) Section 702(b)(1) of the Bilingual Education Act (20 U.S.C. 3222(b)(1)) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1989".

(b) Section 702(b)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "each of the two succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1989".

(c) Section 723(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(d) Section 731(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "February 1, 1980, 1982, and 1984" and inserting in

lieu thereof "February 1 of 1980, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1988, and 1990".

(e) Section 742(f) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(f) Section 751(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "for fiscal year 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "for each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1989".

IMPACT AID

SEC. 3. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress; 20 U.S.C. 236) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" each place it appears in sections 2(a), 3(b), 4(a), and 7(a)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(b) The Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, Eighty-first Congress; 20 U.S.C. 631) is amended—

(1) by striking out "September 30, 1983" in section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1989"; and

(2) by striking out "October 1, 1983" in section 16(a)(1)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

SEC. 4. Section 938 of the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1978 is amended by striking out "three suc-

ceeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "succeeding fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1989".

INDIAN EDUCATION

SEC. 5. (a) Section 303(a)(1) of the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act (20 U.S.C. 241bb(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(b) Sections 422(c), 423(a), and 442(a) of the Indian Education Act (20 U.S.C. 887c–1(c), 887c–2(a), 1221g(a)) are each amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(c) Section 1005(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 3385(g)) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

ELLENDER FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 6. Section 5 of the joint resolution of October 19, 1972 (Public Law 92–506) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1982" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

ASBESTOS DETECTION AND CONTROL

SEC. 7. (a) Section 5(a)(1)(A) of the Asbestos School Hazard Detection and Control Act of 1980 (20 U.S.C. 3604(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

(b) Section 12(a)(1)(A) of such Act is amended by striking out "the succeeding fiscal year" and inserting in lieu

thereof "each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1989".

(c) Section 12(a)(1)(B) of such Act is amended by striking out "the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of the fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1989".

(d) Section 12(a)(2) of such Act is amended by striking out "September 30, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "the end of the fiscal year following the fiscal year for which appropriated".

GENERAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS ACT

SEC. 8. (a) Section 405(b)(7) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

(b) Section 406(g) of such Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1983" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1989".

Chairman PERKINS. Our panel today consists of Mr. James W. Miller, director, Division of Educational Services, Ohio Department of Education; and Mrs. Patric Dorsey, council member, National Advisory Council on Adult Education. Come around both of you.

We welcome you before the committee. We'll start with you Mr. Miller. Proceed in any manner you wish.

[Prepared statement of James W. Miller follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JAMES W. MILLER, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, my name is James Miller, Director of Educational Services for the Ohio Department of Education. On behalf of Dr. Franklin B. Walter, our State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the nearly 60,000 adults enrolled this year in Ohio's Basic Education program, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you to speak on behalf of the Adult Education Act. I have also served as President of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education and hope to bring both a state and national perspective for your consideration.

Before moving to specific comments about the Administration's proposed amendments to the bill and to other recommendations for the Committee to consider, I would like to begin by commending the Chairman and Members of the Committee for your continued support of this important program for the past nineteen years. These words are said not merely to compliment the committee. More importantly, they convey our deep appreciation for investing federal dollars in a program which has had a tremendous positive impact, both economically and personally, on the lives of thousands of adults and children since 1966. My use of the term "adult" should come as no surprise to you but the use of the word "children" might. I include children because of the dramatic impact made on a child whose mother, father, older brother or sister, or sometimes a grandparent, demonstrates the courage to return to school to learn to read and write for the first time.

There is no greater demonstration of the importance of an education than shown by adult students in their quest for freedom and dignity. Educators throughout the nation can tell you about the improved attendance, improved self-discipline and increased achievement shown by children whose parents are ABE students.

The Federal, State and Local partnership in adult education has a proven track record. This record is without major blemishes. The Adult Education Act is simple to administer and delivers the vast percentage of funds to provide direct services to students.

The Administration has recommended some changes in the legislation which represent a retreat rather than progress. These changes could cause a drastic loss of power in what is now a well tuned engine.

Let me be more specific in my comments about the Administration's proposed changes by addressing seven key issues.

*1. Matching and maintenance of effort requirements should both be deleted.*—Such a change would be highly detrimental to the adult education program. The matching and maintenance of effort requirements have been largely responsible for the rapid increase of state and local funds spent for adult education. Difficult economic times combined with the lack of much political clout on the part of ABE students could easily result in a significant reduction of state support if matching and maintenance of effort requirements are dropped.

In my own State of Ohio, which has been severely affected by recent economic conditions, the matching requirement was the critical factor in maintaining state support in our recent appropriations process. Federal support cannot be expected to meet the total needs of the program. Continued emphasis on state support is a must.

Consideration could be given to increasing the state matching requirement over a five-year period. This suggestion would require further study to determine the effects on individual states.

*2. The 5 percent limitation on State administration should be deleted.*—Coming from a state education agency representative, this statement may come as a shock. Nonetheless, our experience shows that 5 percent is quite adequate to administer the program. In Ohio, we have consistently spent less than 5 percent for administration and have reallocated some administrative funds to local schools to provide additional services for students. From a national perspective, I have some fear that if there is no cap on administrative expenses, in times of severe fiscal cutbacks, some states may be tempted to shift other SEA staff to adult education because of the

availability of funds. While one could possibly argue the appropriateness of that decision, I would submit that removing the administrative cap and reducing program funds is an unnecessary temptation, especially when the future of many adults literally depends on the ABE program.

*3. Up to 50 percent of local administrative costs of programs and projects could be paid from funds under the act.*—This recommendation is self-defeating; quite often, the highest number of poor and undereducated adults live in some of our poorest school districts. These school districts include urban cities as well as schools in extremely rural areas. This change could have the effect of steering funds away from adults most in need.

*4. Private, for profit, organizations would be eligible to carry out programs under the act.*—This recommendation is repugnant. The use of the word repugnant is not meant to impugn profit-making institutions because our free enterprise system is the foundation of our entire economic structure. However, one must seriously question the rationale and motives of using the plight of the illiterate adult for profit-making purposes when funds are already insufficient, and where a successful delivery system currently exists with public and private schools, community colleges, technical schools, vocational schools, and many public and private non-profit agencies.

Such a change would create innumerable legal and audit problems, create the possibility of fly-by-night programs quickly organized to serve profit interests more than student interests, and create a system impossible to monitor and accountable to no one.

*5. The Secretary would be permitted to set aside up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national programs.*—This provision, if adopted by the Committee, should not go into effect until triggered by a much higher appropriation; and amount of $125 million would seem to be a reasonable base. Even then, questions must be raised as to how such funds would be utilized; a 2 percent cap might be more reasonable.

*6. The 20 percent cap on institutionalized adults would be deleted.*—The removal of the cap poses a major threat to the overall program which is apparently not preceived by the Administration. Given the politics and/or possible litigation in certain states, it is entirely within the realm of possibility that a governor or judge could decree that a significant portion of the state allocation be directed toward the corrections system or to the thousands of severely retarded adults moving from state institutions into community halfway houses. This is not to say these adults do not deserve ABE service. They are entitled to service and such adults are enrolled in each of the states. However, the 20 percent cap guarantees that funds are available for many kinds of adults, including adults on public assistance, unemployed adults, and students learning English as a second language. A major emphasis must remain on those adults who can become taxpayers instead of taxusers. According to the Department of Education staff, only 4 percent of funds nationally are currently spent on institutionalized adults. The old question of "if it ain't broke why fix it?" should be raised on this issue. There is ample opportunity to increase services for institutionalized adults without changing current law.

*7. The 10 percent retained for teacher training and special demonstration projects should be deleted.*—This proposal has merit as long as there is language which authorizes expenditures of funds for such purposes.

The following are specific recommendations for improving current legislation.

1. Sections 311, 316, 317 and 318, which address the elderly, Native Americans, Indo-Chinese and immigrants, should be deleted. Such students are now eligible for services and do enroll in the ABE program.

2. Rather than language calling for such sums as may be necessary, new language should contain incremental authorizations of $180, $205, $255 and $290 million. Given the national concern for improved literacy, these amounts are actually too conservative.

3. The 10 percent requirement to spend funds for teacher training and special demonstration projects should be deleted. Language should be retained to allow expenditures for this purpose up to a limit of a set percentage. Five or ten percent would be acceptable limits.

4. If it is desirable to allow the Secretary of Education to have discretionary funds, such a provision should not become effective until at least an appropriation level of $125 million would be reached. Consideration should be given to a 2 percent set-aside rather than the 5 percent requested by the Administration.

5. Consideration could be given to revising the definition of literacy. In the view of many, literacy is more than the important basic skills of reading, writing and mathematics. The skills necessary to function effectively in our complex American socie-

ty differ greatly from the literacy skills that may be adequate in a country such as Pakistan.

6. The linkage of ABE with Chapter 1 and programs funded through the Jobs Training Partnership Act should be stressed as much as possible. Students served in ABE are comprised of many parents of Chapter 1 children as well as thousands of participants in JTPA programs.

7 Data collection needs to be improved. Care should be taken to insure that data collection mandated in the law should be of a priority nature, capable of being collected, and not unduly burdensome on state and local agencies. No data system should be designed without state and local input, beginning with the initial design of the system. Past experience indicates that our involvement usually came after the fact.

8. The 20 percent caps on GED and services to institutionalized adults should be maintained as well as the 5 percent cap on State Administration. The three-year state plan was a good change and should be continued.

9. The National Advisory Council for Adult Education should be maintained. They have provided effective visibility for adult education.

10. It is recognized that without reauthorization by the committee, nothing is possible. Given your continued leadership, an equally important action would be to greatly increase the appropriation for this program. Current efforts are helping hundreds of thousands of adults. Countless numbers of volunteers are helping many other adults. Yet, we are merely reaching the tip of the iceberg.

In closing, I would like to quote Mr. Leo Albert from the Association of American Publishers who said, "The ugliest censor of them all, and the one that worries me most, is illiteracy; for illiteracy blocks more people from what they need to know in order to be happy and free to be productive citizens of this society than all other censors combined."

A recent news release from one of the distinguished members of this Committee, Mr. Paul Simon, one of the leading supporters of literacy efforts, included this statement: "We have hidden the reality of adult illiteracy, much as we once hid the problem of mental retardation. I see it among my Illinois constituents when I ask people to sign what we call a 'consent form' to help in problems with Social Security and other agencies. Adult illiteracy is a financial drain on our society in a great many ways, and it is growing."

The costly effects of illiteracy are reflected dramatically in funds spent for public assistance programs, for unemployment compensation, for maintaining our institutions for adult and youth offenders, for training costs incurred in business and industry and military, and for time lost in preparing adults to participate in JTPA and similar programs.

The damage does not fall upon the illiterate alone; it affects society in areas other than economics. I would submit that political leaders such as yourselves can be limited by the wisdom—or lack of wisdom—of our citizens. Dictators can marshall the illiterate for unlimited purposes. In a dictatorship, the illiterate are prisoners of the tyrant. In a democracy, a wise leader can become the prisoner of ignorance. Indeed, global illiteracy in the long run is a far greater danger to our future than the Iron Curtain.

Thank you Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee for your support. Although you seldom have the pleasure of seeing the actual difference the program makes in the lives of individual adults, your support provides the basis for that difference.

"The young man died because he couldn't read a plainly worded safety warning. He couldn't read the words that would have saved his life." (From an episode of "Quincy", entitled "A Loss of Words", shown on NBC in 1983.)

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION STATE OF OHIO

| | Fiscal year— | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
| Total enrollment | 41,137 | 50,056 | 52,136 | 55,546 | 52,140 |
| Impact data: | | | | | |
| 1. Completed Adult Education Program through eighth grade | 8,784 | 11,960 | 12,382 | 12,635 | 13,062 |
| 2. Passed general educational development test | 3,056 | 3,978 | 5,439 | 4,872 | 5,886 |
| 3. Graduated from adult secondary education after starting in adult basic education | 732 | 2,954 | 1,152 | 1,276 | 1,657 |

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION STATE OF OHIO—Continued

| | Fiscal year— | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
| 4. Enrolled in another education/training program as a result of experience gained in ABE | 2,984 | 3,185 | 4,417 | 3,887 | 3,595 |
| 5. Are enrolled in program who are unemployed | 22,444 | 27,295 | 30,555 | 34,964 | 31,773 |
| 6. Are enrolled in program who are receiving public assistance | 9,127 | 11,949 | 12,055 | 13,508 | 14,197 |
| 7. Were removed from public assistance rolls | 1,135 | 1,606 | 1,700 | 1,638 | 1,543 |
| 8. Obtained jobs as a result of experience gained in program | 2,576 | 3,649 | 2,691 | 2,153 | 2,342 |
| 9. Changed to or were upgraded to a better job as a result of experience in program | 1,144 | 1,665 | 1,363 | 1,174 | 1,016 |
| 10. Registered to vote for the first time | 698 | 1,542 | 1,439 | 1,413 | 1,604 |
| 11. Received U.S. citizenship | 181 | 258 | 194 | 116 | 140 |
| 12. Received driver's license | 454 | 581 | 527 | 676 | 428 |
| 13. Received training in completing income tax forms | 2,087 | 3,112 | 3,589 | 3,651 | 2,837 |
| 14. Are enrolled in programs that were established for institutionalized persons | 1,756 | 3,839 | 4,695 | 7,532 | 7,623 |
| 15. Are enrolled in programs for persons of limited English-speaking ability | 4,126 | 6,550 | 5,551 | 5,407 | 6,225 |

STATE OF OHIO ADULT BASIC EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 1983 ANNUAL REPORT HIGHLIGHTS—PARTICIPANTS BY ETHNIC GROUP

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| American Indian or Alaskan Native | 215 | 0.4 |
| Black | 15,244 | 29.2 |
| Asian | 2,324 | 4.5 |
| Hispanic | 1,631 | 3.1 |
| Others | 32,726 | 62.8 |
| Total | 52,140 | 100.0 |
| Number of participants by sex: | | |
| Women | 26,328 | 51 |
| Men | 25,328 | 49 |
| Number of participants by age: | | |
| 16 to 44 | 46,873 | 90 |
| 45 to 64 | 4,856 | 9 |
| 65-plus | 411 | 1 |
| Number of participants by level: | | |
| Level I | 44,216 | 85 |
| Level II | 7,924 | 15 |
| Staff: | | |
| Number of personnel | 1,181 | |
| Equivalent number of full-time personnel | 381 | |
| Number taking training | 836 | |
| Contact hours and cost: | | |
| Total number of contact hours | 4,542,013 | |
| Average number of contact hours per student | 87 | |
| Cost per hour of instruction | $1.27 | |
| Cost per person | $111.06 | |

ADULT BASIC EDUCATION, STATE OF OHIO, FISCAL YEAR 1983

Ohio's Adult Basic Education Program provides services to residents who: (1) have less than a twelfth grade education or its functional equivalence and, (2) are not currently required to be enrolled in school.

Free instruction is offered in basic and life skills, general work skills, secondary completion (General Educational Development Test preparation), and English as a Second Language.

In fiscal year 1983, a total of 52,140 Ohio adults were enrolled. Of these, 85 percent were functioning at or below the eighth grade equivalence level at the time of their enrollment; 61 percent were unemployed; and 27 percent were receiving public assistance.

*Economic and employment impact data*

| | |
|---|---|
| Expenditures: | |
| Federal | $3,899,937 |
| State | 1,100,000 |
| Local | 790,500 |
| Total | 5,790,437 |
| Benefits: | |
| 1,543 adults removed from public assistance for savings of | [1] 6,054,732 |
| 2,342 adults secured new employment for income of | [1] 16,319,056 |
| 1,016 adults received job promotions for increased income of | [1] 422,545 |

[1] Public assistance savings based on number of removals times annual benefit of $3,924.

Income estimates based on number of adults multiplied by minimum hourly wage of $3.35/hour for new employees and an additional $.20/hour for those receiving job promotions.

For more information, contact: The Ohio Department of Education, Division of Educational Services, 65 South Front Street, Room 811, Columbus, Ohio 43215, 614-466-5015.

## STATEMENT OF JAMES W. MILLER, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am James Miller, director, Educational Services, from Ohio. On behalf of Dr. Franklin B. Walter, our State superintendent of public instruction, and the nearly 60,000 adults enrolled this year in Ohio's Adult Basic Education Program, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you to speak on behalf of the Adult Education Act. I have also served as president of the American Association for Adult and Continuing Education and hope to bring both a State and national perspective for your consideration.

Before moving to specific comments about the administration's proposed amendments to the bill and to other recommendations for the committee to consider, I would like to begin by commending the chairman and the members of the committee for your continued support of this important program for the past 19 years. These words are said not merely to compliment the committee. More importantly, they convey our deep appreciation for investing Federal dollars in a program which has had a tremendous positive impact, both economically and personally, on the lives of thousands of adults and children since 1966.

My use of the term "adult" should come as no surprise to you but the use of the word "children" might. I include children because of the dramatic impact made on a child whose mother, father, older brother or sister, or sometimes a grandparent, demonstrates the courage to return to school to learn to read and write for the first time.

There is no greater demonstration of the importance of an education than shown by adult students in their quest for freedom and dignity. Educators throughout the Nation can tell you about the

improved attendance, improved self-discipline and increased achievement shown by children whose parents are ABE students.

The Federal, State, and local partnership in adult education has a proven track record. This record is without major blemishes. The Adult Education Act is simple to administer and delivers the vast percentage of funds to provide direct services to students.

The administration has recommended some changes in this legislation which represent a retreat rather than progress. These changes could cause a drastic loss of power in what is now a well-tuned engine.

Let me be more specific in my comments about the administration's proposed changes by addressing seven key issues.

First, the matching and maintenance of effort requirements should both be deleted. Such a change would be highly detrimental to the adult education program. The matching and maintenance of effort requirements have been largely responsible for the rapid increase of State and local funds spent for adult education. Difficult economic times combined with the lack of much political clout on the part of ABE students could easily result in a significant reduction of State support if matching and maintenance of effort of requirements are dropped.

In my own State of Ohio, which has been severely affected by recent economic conditions, the matching requirement was the critical factor in maintaining State support in our recent appropriations process. Federal support cannot be expected to meet the total needs of the program. Continued emphasis on State support is a must.

Consideration could be given to increasing the State matching requirement over a 5-year period. This suggestion would require further study to determine the effects on individual States.

The second proposal is removing the 5-percent limitation on State administration. This may come as a shock from a State education agency representative, but we believe the 5 percent is adequate. As a matter of fact, as an individual State, we spent less than that and we put the unused administrative funds back into program services.

The third proposal is the recommendation that 50 percent of local administrative costs of programs and projects would be paid from funds under the act. We believe this recommendation is self-defeating because there is an interesting corollary. Many of our poor and undereducated adults also live in some of our school districts that have the most financial constraints, whether that be in the inner city or in the extreme rural areas of our State or Kentucky or other locations.

Fourth, the administration proposes that private, for-profit organizations would be eligible to carry out programs under the act. We believe this would be a serious mistake—using the plight of the illiterate adult in the profitmaking realm, the audit and legal problems that it poses, the possibility of fly-by-night, quickly organized to serve profit interests more than student interests, and the monitoring and accountability problems would be rather considerable.

The fifth recommendation is that the Secretary would be permitted to set aside up to 5 percent of the appropriations for national programs. This proposal has some merit, but we believe it should

not go into effect until triggered by a much higher appropriation, perhaps a base of $125 million and perhaps of 2 to 3 percent might be reasonable to consider.

It's also proposed to delete the 20-percent cap on institutionalized adults. We do believe that the cap on institutionalized adults helps guarantee a spread of services to the many different kinds of populations eligible for this program.

According to the Department of Education staff, currently 4 percent is being spent on this on a national basis so there is ample opportunity within the current law to expand the services, if that's desired. We believe that the 20-percent cap guarantees that funds can also be spent for adults on public assistance and those who are unemployed, students learning English as a second language, and guarantees of spread of services. We have some concern that in certain States, given the political climate or the possibility of litigation, that it could be decreed that a significant portion of the State's allocation would be allocated to institutionalized adults. We think that is a serious consideration for this committee.

The administration also proposes to delete the 10-percent mandate for teacher training and special demonstration projects. This proposal has merit. We would hope that there would be language which would authorize expenditures of funds for such purposes because certain needs still remain.

Also in the testimony are some specific recommendations for improving current legislation. Certainly the authorization levels are crucial and we would hope they would receive major consideration by the committee. There are certain sections addressing certain populations which should deleted. The students are already eligible for the program and are receiving services and are not receiving any special appropriation.

We think the linkage of this program with chapter 1 and the Jobs Training Partnership Act is important. The parents of many chapter 1 children are also ABE students.

Data collection needs to be improved. We would ask that local districts, local applicants, and State education agencies be represented in the design of any new system. All too often our involvement has come after the fact.

We believe that the National Advisory Council for Adult Education should be maintained. They provide an effective visibility for adult education and a valuable service for the field.

There are other comments in the series of recommendations which you may wish to consider.

In closing, I would like to quote Mr. Leo Albert from the Association of American Publishers who said, "The ugliest censor of them all and the one that worries me most is illiteracy, for illiteracy blocks more people from what they need to know in order to be happy and free to be productive citizens of this society than all other censors combined."

A recent news release from one of the distinguished members of this committee, Mr. Paul Simon, said, and I quote "We have hidden the reality of adult illiteracy, much as we once hid the problems of mental retardation."

The costly effects of illiteracy are reflected dramatically in funds spent for public assistance programs, for unemployment compensa-

tion, for maintaining our institutions for adult and youth offenders, for training costs incurred in business and industry and the military, and for time lost in preparing adults to participate in JTPA and similar programs.

The damage does not fall upon the illiterate alone. It affects society in areas other than economics. I would submit that political leaders such as yourselves can be limited by the wisdom—or lack of wisdom—of our citizens. Dictators can marshal the illiterate for unlimited purposes. In a dictatorship, the illiterate are prisoners of the tyrant. In a democracy, a wise leader can become the prisoner of ignorance. Indeed, global illiteracy in the long run is a far greater danger to our future than the Iron Curtain. The 90-percent illiteracy rate in South America is largely responsible for many of the programs there.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for your support. Although you seldom have the pleasure of seeing the actual difference the program makes in the lives of individual adults, your support provides the basis for that difference.

I would like to close with a short poem by Langston Hughes, which goes something like this: "What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun or fester like a sore and then run? Does it stink like rotten meat or crust and sugar over like a syrupy sweet? Maybe it just sags like a heavy load or does it explode?"

I would submit that this program addresses the deferred dreams of millions of Americans and is probably one of the most important programs this committee has ever enacted. We appreciate your support and would be happy to respond to any questions.

Chairman PERKINS. We'll hear from Mrs. Dorsey and then we will question the witnesses.

Go ahead, Ms. Dorsey.

[Prepared statement of Patric Dorsey follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PATRIC DORSEY, NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Patric Dorsey from North Carolina, Chairman of the Governmental Relations and Legislation Committee of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. With me is Mr. Rick Ventura, Executive Director of the Council. We appreciate the opportunity to represent the Council and to present testimony on the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. My comments will be brief and to the point.

The Council has devoted considerable time and effort toward a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the Adult Education Act. Numerous site visitations and countless conversations with adult educators, administrators and students over the past two years have familiarized this Council with the programmatic impact of the existing legislation. In preparation of this testimony, the Council scheduled nationwide nine hearings on the reauthorization of the Act. Approximately 200 knowledgeable witnesses testified before the Council at those hearings. The Council has considered the points raised in both formal testimony and informal conversation. We have analyzed and debated the merits of those points and have, on the basis of those deliberations, developed the following recommendations which we respectfully submit for consideration.

The Council strongly urges the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. To this end, the Council has developed the following recommendations which embody changes of two types. The first category reflects changes of a technical nature or changes designed to enhance clarity, to simplify the language and the Act, and to emphasize basic educational opportunities and skills. For example, references in the Act to the "commissioner" be changed to read the "secretary".

The second category includes changes of a more substantive nature. During the several national hearings conducted by the Council, the designation of special populations within the Act was commented upon with great frequency. Nearly 80% of those commenting on special populations called for their elimination from the Act. Specifically, the vast majority of adult educators with whom we spoke regarding this issue strongly advocated the elimination of references to special populations. The Council, therefore, recommends specific references to designated populations be eliminated. Three arguments were consistently advanced by those who commented on the issue:

(a) The existing legislation is intended to serve all adults, sixteen years of age or older who have neither a high school degree or its equivalency and are no longer in school or required to be in school.

(b) The needs of special groups can be addressed through individual state plans.

(c) References to special populations frequently result in duplication of effort.

As currently written, references to special populations include: Section 311, "Special Projects of the Elderly"; Section 316, "Improvement of Educational Opportunities for Adult Indians"; Section 318, "Adult Education Program for Adult Immigrants."

Section 306, (b)(11) of the Act requires that, "special assistance be given to the needs of persons with limited English proficiency by providing a bilingual adult education program of instruction in English, and to the extent necessary to allow such persons to progress effectively through the adult education program in the native language of such persons . . .". As presently written, the Act results in program cost increases in direct proportion to the number of different nationalities in a community. Virtually, all those who addressed this issue to the Council sighted the lack of qualified instructors in several languages as an additional obstacle to satisfying the bilingual requirement.

It is the Council's recommendation that all references in the Act to "bilingual education" be eliminated and replaced with references to instruction in "English as a second language" or "English for speakers of other languages".

Classes conducted in English as a second language have consistently met the needs of those adult students not conversant in English, yet desirous of developing those literacy skills necessary to progress effectively through adult education programs. In the opinion of the Council, such a change would not only be endorsed by the overwhelming majority of adult educators but would more accurately reflect the educational and programmatic requirements of individual communities.

With respect to Section 307, "Payments", the Council recommends an increase in the State share of expenditures from 10% to 20% of the total and a decrease in the federal share from 90% to 80% of total expenditures.

The Council forwards this recommendation with the understanding that such an increase in state expenditures would occur gradually over a specified period of time, perhaps 3 to 5 years, and that the states requirement to maintain effort be retained.

Section 309, "Research, Development, Dissemination, Evaluation and Information Clearinghouse", has consistently received significant attention by those commenting to the Council. In the opinion of the Council, there is an overwhelming need for the Department of Education to develop uniform, standardized reporting procedures for adult education program data from the states. The great majority of adult educators and administrators insist that the collection of standardized data is not a burden. In fact, to the contrary, the collection of standardized data assists the states in evaluating program effectiveness.

Regarding Section 312, "State Advisory Councils", the Council finds the existing language unnecessarily prescriptive. In order to reduce the restrictive nature of the existing legislation and encourage greater flexibility at the state level, the Council recommends the elimination of the majority of this section as well as a rewording of (b)(2) to read, "Such a State Advisory Council shall advise the state agency to carry out the responsibility of the Act."

At this point, the Council has included with this testimony a copy of the existing legislation with specific notations reflecting the Council's recommended changes.

With respect to Section 313, "The National Advisory Council on Adult Education", the Council recommends (b) be reworded to read, "The Council shall consist of fifteen members a majority of whom shall be comprised of persons knowledgeable in business, industry and other endeavors in which adults are gainfully employed. Such Council shall include persons knowledgeable in the field of education, state and local school officials, and other persons having special knowledge and experience or qualifications with respect to adult education."

The Council bases this recommended rewording on a sincere desire to ensure the broadening of Council membership beyond the educational community.

Lastly the Council recommends under Section 315, "Appropriations Authorized", that such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding year of the life of the reauthorized Act be authorized to be appropriated.

Although I have not commented on all the Council's recommended changes, I would once again call your attention to the included copy of the existing legislation with the Council's recommendations clearly outlined.

In developing these recommendations, it has been the intention of the Council to assure the integrity of the Act and to promote the most efficient and effective utilization of federal resources.

# The Adult Education Act

National Advisory Council on Adult Education
425 13th Street, N.W., Suite #323
Washington, D. C. 20004
202/376-8892

Substitute "Secretary" for "Commissioner" and "Department of Education" for "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

COMMENTS

**The Adult Education Act**

*Short Title*

Sec. 301. This title may be cited as the "Adult Education Act".

*Statement of Purpose*

Sec. 302. It is the purpose of this title to ~~expand~~ educational opportunities for adults and to encourage the establishment of programs of adult education that will—

(1) enable all adults to acquire basic skills ~~necessary to function in society~~,

(2) enable adults who so desire to continue their education to at least the level of completion of secondary school, and

(3) make available to adults the means to secure training that will enable them to become more employable, productive, and responsible citizens.

offer basic

educational

basic and education

*Definitions*

Sec. 303. As used in this title—

(a) The term "adult" means any individual who has attained the age of sixteen.

(b) The term "adult education" means services or instruction below the college level (as determined by the Commissioner), for adults who—

(1) lack sufficient mastery of basic educational skills to enable them to function effectively in society or who do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education and who have not achieved an equivalent level of education, and

(2) are not currently required to be enrolled in schools.

(c) The term "adult basic education" means adult education for adults whose inability to speak, read, or write the English language constitutes a substantial impairment of their ability to get or retain employment commensurate with their real ability, which is designed to help eliminate such inability and raise the level of education at which individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, to improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and to making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities.

below the high school level

increase their education or

(d) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(e) The term "Community school program" is a program in which a public building, including but not limited to a public elementary or secondary school or a community or junior college, is used as a

BEST COPY

COMMENTS

BEST COPY

community center operated in conjunction with other groups in the community, community organizations, and local governmental agencies, to provide educational, recreational, cultural, and other related community services for the community that center serves in accordance with the needs, interests, and concerns of that community.

(f) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools, except that, if there is a separate board or other legally constituted local authority having administrative control and direction of adult education in public schools therein, such term means such other board or authority.

(g) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and (except for the purposes of section 305(a)) Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands.

(h) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or if there is a separate State agency or officer primarily responsible for supervision of adult education in public schools, then such agency or officer may be designated for the purpose of this title by the Governor or by State law. If no agency or officer qualifies under the preceding sentence, such term shall mean an appropriate agency or officer designated for the purposes of this title by the Governor.

~~(i) The term "academic education" means the theoretical, the liberal, the speculative, and classical subjects usually found to compose the curriculum of the public secondary school.~~

(j) the term "institution of higher education" means any such institution as defined by section 801(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Grants to States

Sec. 304. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to States, which have State plans approved by him under section 308 for the purposes of this section, to pay the Federal share of the cost of (1) the establishment or expansion of adult basic

COMMENTS

BEST COPY

education programs . . be carried out by local educational agencies and by public or private non-profit agencies, organizations, and institutions and (2) the establishment or expansion of adult education programs to be carried out by local educational agencies and by public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions. Grants provided under this section to States to carry out the programs described in the preceding sentence may be carried out by public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions only if the applicable local educational agency has been consulted with and has had an opportunity to comment on the application of such agency, organization, or institution. The State educational agency shall not approve any application unless assured that such consultation has taken place. Such application shall contain a description of the cooperative arrangements that have been made to deliver services to adult students.

(b) Not more than 20 per centum of the funds granted to any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be used for the education of institutionalized individuals.

*Allotment for Adult Education*

Sec. 305. (a) From the sums available for purposes of section 304(a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for any succeeding fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot (1) not more than 1 per centum thereof among Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under such section, and (2) $150,000 to each State. From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of adults who do not have a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education (or its equivalent) and who are not currently required to be enrolled in schools in such State bears to the number of such adults in all States. From the sums available for purposes of section 304(a) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and the succeeding fiscal year, the Commissioner shall make allotments in accordance with section 305(a) of the Adult Education Act of 1966 as in effect on June 30, 1969.

(b) The portion of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for a fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required, for the period such allotment is available, for carrying out the State plan approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such period as the Commissioner shall fix, to other States in

COMMENTS

proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for such year, but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum which the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such period for carrying out its State plan approved under this title, and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts are not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year.

*State Plans*

Sec. 308. (a) A State shall be eligible to receive its allotment under section 305 if—

(1) it has on file with the Commissioner a general State application under section 435 of the General Education Provisions Act, and

(2) it has submitted to the Commissioner at such times (not more frequently than one every three years) as the Commissioner may require, such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe a State plan meeting the requirements of subsection (b).

five

(b) A State plan under this title shall—

(1) set forth a program for the use of funds provided under this title to carry out the purposes stated in section 302 with respect to all segments of the adult population in the State, including residents of rural areas, residents of urban areas with high rates of unemployment, adults with limited English language skills, and institutionalized adults;

(2) provide for the administration of the program by the State educational agency;

(3) describe the procedures the State will use to insure that in carrying out such program there will be adequate consultation, cooperation, and coordination among the State educational agency, State manpower service councils, State occupational information systems, and other agencies, organizations, and institutions in the State which operate employment and training programs or other educational or training programs for adults, and for coordination of programs carried on under this title with other programs, including reading improvement programs, designed to provide reading instruction for adults carried on by State and local agencies;

and reciprocal

(4) identify (A) the needs of the population of the State for services authorized under this title, (B) the other resources in the State available to meet those needs, and (C) the goals the State will seek to achieve in meeting those needs over the period covered by the plan;

(5) provide that such agency will make available not to exceed 20 per centum of the State's allotment for programs of equivalency for a certificate of graduation from a secondary school;

BEST COPY

COMMENTS

(6) provide ~~such~~ fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid the State under this title (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies and public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions);

uniform reporting procedures that assure

(7) describe the means by which the delivery of adult education services will be ~~expanded~~ broadened through the use of agencies, institutions, and organizations other than the public school systems, such as business, labor unions, libraries, institutions of higher education, public health authorities, antipoverty programs, and community organizations;

broadened

(8) describe the means by which representatives of business and industry, labor unions, public and private educational agencies and institutions, churches, fraternal and voluntary organizations, community organizations, State and local manpower and training agencies, and representatives of special adult populations, including residents of rural areas, residents of urban areas with high rates of unemployment, adults with limited English language skills, and institutionalized adults, and other entities in the State concerned with adult education have been involved in the development of the plan and will continue to be involved in carrying out the plan, especially with regard to the expansion of the delivery of adult education services through those agencies, institutions, and organizations;

describe the means by which representatives from the public and private sector are involved in the development and implementation of the plan, especially the expansion of the delivery of adult education services by cooperation and collaboration with those public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations.

(9) describe the efforts to be undertaken by the State to ~~secure adult participation in adult education~~ programs through flexible course schedules, convenient locations, adequate transportation, and meeting child care needs;

attract adults, particularly those requiring adult basic education, to programs to be offered and to assist their participation in such

(10) provide that special emphasis be given to adult basic education programs except where such needs are shown to have been met in the State;

(11) provide that special assistance be given to the needs of persons with limited English proficiency (as defined in section 703(a) of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) by providing ~~bilingual adult education programs, of instruction in English and~~, to the extent necessary to allow such persons to progress effectively through the adult education program, to the native language of such persons, carried out in coordination with programs of bilingual education assisted under title VII and bilingual vocational education programs under the Vocational Education Act of 1963;

and those who speak other languages

English as a second language

(12) demonstrate that the special educational needs of adult immigrants in the State have been examined, and provision for the implementation of adult education and adult basic education programs for immigrants to meet existing needs;

(13) set forth the criteria by which the State will evaluate the quality of proposals from local agencies, organizations, and institutions; and



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

(14) provide such further information and assurances as the Commissioner may by regulation require, including information regarding the extent to which the goals of the program have been achieved during the preceding three years.

(c) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

*Payments*

Sec. 307. (a) The Federal share of expenditures to carry out a State plan shall be paid from a State's allotment available for grants to that state. The Federal share shall be 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out the State's programs, except that with respect to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Federal share shall be 100 per centum. — 80 per centum

(b) No payment shall be made to any State from its allotment for any fiscal year unless the Commissioner finds that the fiscal effort per student or the amount available for expenditure by such State for adult education from non Federal sources for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such fiscal effort per student or such amount available for expenditure for such purposes from such sources during the second preceding fiscal year; but no State shall be required to use its funds to supplant any portion of the Federal share.

*Operation of State Plans, Hearings and Judicial Review*

Sec. 308. (a) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a State plan approved under this title, finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 306, or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments may be made to such State under this title (or payments shall be limited to programs under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

(b) A State educational agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under section 308 or subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner or any officer designated by him forthat purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Commissioner may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his precious action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to the review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commissioner's action.

*Research, Development, Dissemination, Evaluation, and Information Clearinghouse*

Sec. 309. (a)(1) Subject to appropriations under this section, the Commissioner shall directly, and through grants and contracts with public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations, carry out a program—

(A) to develop new and promising approaches and innovative methods which are designed to address those problems and which may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this Act, including one-year grants to States to plan for the expansion of their systems for the delivery of adult education services;

(B) to determine, using appropriate objective evaluation criteria, which projects and approaches assisted under clauses (A) and under section 310 of this Act have achieved their stated goals and are capable of achieving comparable levels of effectiveness at additional locations; and



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

(C) disseminate throughout the Nation information about those approaches or methods pertaining to adult basic education which are most effective, by establishing and operating a clearing-house on adult education which shall collect, select, and disseminate to the public information pertaining to the education of adults, those approaches and methods of educating adults which are most effective, and ways of coordinating adult education programs with manpower and other education programs.

to improve efficiency of delivery and avoid duplication and unnecessary expense, as well as current research,

(2) The Commissioner shall directly, and through grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions and organizations, evaluate the effectiveness of programs conducted under section 304 of this Act.

By using uniform reporting procedures, the Secretary

(b) In addition to the responsibilities of the Director under section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act and subject to appropriations under this section, the Director of the National Institute of Education, in consultation with the Commissioner, shall directly and through grants and contracts with public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, carry out a program to conduct research on the special needs of individuals requiring adult education.

(c) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section ~~$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1980, $9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1981, and $9,000,000~~ for each succeeding fiscal year prior to October 1, ~~2000~~ 1985.

*Use of Funds for Special Experimental Demonstration Projects and Teacher Training*

Sec. 310. Of the funds allotted to a State under section 305 for a fiscal year, not ~~more than~~ to exceed 10 per centum shall be used for—

(1) special projects which will be carried out in furtherance of the purposes of this title, and which—

(A) involve the use of innovative methods, including methods for educating persons of limited English-speaking ability, systems, materials, or programs which may have national significance or be of special value in promoting effective programs under this title, or

(B) involve programs of adult education, including education for persons of limited English-speaking ability, which are part of community school programs, carried out in cooperation with other Federal, federally assisted, State, or local programs which have unusual promise in promoting a comprehensive or coordinated approach to the problems of persons with educational deficiencies; and

(2) training persons engaged, or preparing to engage, as personnel in programs designed to carry out the purposes of this title.



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

*Special Projects for the Elderly*

Sec. 311. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to State and local educational agencies or other public or private non-profit agencies for programs to further the purpose of this Act by providing educational programs for elderly persons whose ability to speak and read the English language is limited and who live in an area with a culture different than their own. Such programs shall be designed to equip such elderly persons to deal successfully with the practical problems in their everyday life, including the making of purchases, meeting their transportation and housing needs, and complying with governmental requirements such as those for obtaining citizenship, public assistance and social security benefits, and housing.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this section there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and each succeeding fiscal year ending prior to October 1, 1983.

(c) In carrying out the program authorized by this section, the Commissioner shall consult with the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging for the purpose of coordinating, where practicable, the programs assisted under this section with the programs assisted under the Older Americans Act of 1965.

*State Advisory Councils*

Sec. 312. (a) Any State which receives assistance under this title may establish and maintain a State advisory council, or may designate and maintain an existing State advisory council, which shall be or has been appointed by the Governor or, in the case of a State in which members of [illegible] which governs the State education agency are elected (including election by the State legislature), by such board.

(b)(1) Such a State advisory council shall include as members persons who, by reason of experience or training, are knowledgeable in the field of adult education or who are officials of the state educational agency or of local educational agencies of that State, persons who are or have received adult educational services, and persons who are representative of the general public.

(2) Such a State advisory council in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, shall—

(A) advise the State educational agency on the development of, and policy matters arising in the administration of the State plan approved pursuant to section 308;

(B) advise with respect to long-range planning and studies to evaluate adult education programs, services, and activities assisted under this Act; and

(C) prepare and submit to the State educational agency, and to the National Advisory Council on Adult Education established pursuant to section 313, an annual report of its recommendations, accompanied by such additional comments of

shall advise the state agency in carrying out the responsibilities of this Act.



BEST COPY

the State educational agency as that agency deems appropriate.

(c) Upon the appointment of any such advisory council, the appointing authority under subsection (a) of this section shall inform the Commissioner of the establishment of, and membership in, its State advisory council. The Commissioner shall, upon receiving such information, certify that each such council is in compliance with the membership requirements set forth in subsection (b)(1) of this section.

(d) Each such State advisory council shall meet within thirty days after certification has been accepted by the Commissioner under subsection (c) of this section and select from among its membership a chairman. The time, place, and manner of subsequent meetings shall be provided by the rules of the State advisory council, except that such rules shall provide that each such council meet at least four times each year, including at least one public meeting at which the public is given the opportunity to express views concerning adult education.

(e) Each such State advisory council is authorized to obtain the services of such professional, technical, and clerical personnel as may be necessary to enable them to carry out their functions under this section.

*National Advisory Council on Adult Education*

Sec. 313. (a) The President shall appoint a National Advisory Council on Adult Education (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Council").

(b) The Council shall consist of fifteen members who shall, to the extent possible, include persons knowledgeable in the field of adult education, State and local public school officials, and other persons having special knowledge and experience, or qualifications with respect to adult education, including education for persons of limited English-speaking ability in which instruction is given in English and to the extent necessary to allow such persons to progress effectively through the adult education program, in the native language of such persons, and persons representative of the general public. The Council shall meet initially at the call of the Commissioner and elect from its number a chairman. The Council will thereafter meet at the call of the chairman, but not less often than twice a year. Subject to section 448(b) of the General Education Provisions Act, the Council shall continue to exist until October 1, 1984.

(c) The Council shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including policies and procedures governing the approval of State plans under section 308 and policies to eliminate duplication, and to effectuate the coordination of programs under this title and other programs offering adult education activities and services.

COMMENTS

a majority of whom shall be comprised by persons knowledgeable in business, industry, and other endeavors in which adults are gainfully employed. Such Council shall include persons knowledgeable in the field of education, state and local public school officials, and other persons having special knowledge and experience, or qualifications with respect to adult education.



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

(d) The Council shall review the administration and effectiveness of programs under this title, make recommendations with respect thereto, and make annual reports to the President of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in this title and other Federal laws relating to adult education activities and services). The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall coordinate the work of the Council with that of other related advisory councils.

*Limitation*

Sec. 314. No grant may be made under this title for any educational program, activity, or service related to sectarian instruction or religious worship, or provided by a school or department of divinity. For purposes of this section, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

*Appropriations Authorized*

*Sec. 315. (a) Except as otherwise provided, there are authorized to be appropriated $210,000,000 for fiscal year 1979, $230,000,000 for fiscal year 1980, $250,000,000 for fiscal year 1981, $270,000,000 for fiscal year 1982, and $290,000,000 for fiscal year 1983 to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) There are further authorized to be appropriated for each such fiscal year such sums not to exceed 5 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for that year as may be necessary to pay the cost of the administration and development of State plans, and other activities required pursuant to this title. The amount provided to a State under this subsection shall not be less than $50,00 for any fiscal year, except that such amount shall not be less than $25,000 in the case of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

*Improvement of Educational Opportunities for Adult Indians*

Sec. 316. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out a program of making grants to State and local educational agencies, and to Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations, to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects which are designed to plan for, and test and demonstrate the effectiveness of, programs for providing adult education for Indians—

(1) to support planning, pilot, and demonstration projects which are designed to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of programs for improving employment and educational opportunities for adult Indians;

*Sec. 315(a) The total amount of appropriations to carry out the Adult Education Act shall not exceed $100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1982, 1983, and 1984.

For the purpose of carrying out this Act there shall be authorized to be appropriated an amount which equals the dollar amount commensurate with the requirements of this Act for fiscal year 1985 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding year.

-11-

BEST COPY

COMMENTS

(g) to assist in the establishment and operation of programs which are designed to stimulate (A) the provisions of basic literacy opportunities to all nonliterate Indian adults, and (B) the provision of opportunities to all Indian adults to qualify for a high school equivalency certificate in the shortest period of time feasible;

(3) to support a major research and development program to develop more innovative and effective techniques for achieving the literacy and high school equivalency goals;

(4) to provide for basic surveys and evaluations thereof to define accurately the extent of the problems of illiteracy and lack of high school completion among Indians;

(5) to encourage the dissemination of information and materials relating to, and the evaluation of the effectiveness of, education programs which may offer educational opportunities to Indian adults.

(b) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to Indian tribes, Indian institutions, and Indian organizations to develop and establish educational services and programs specifically designed to improve educational opportunities for Indian adults.

(c) The Commissioner is also authorized to make grants to, and contracts with, public agencies, and institutions, and Indian tribes, institutions, and organizations for—

(1) the dissemination of information concerning educational programs, services, and resources available to Indian adults, including evaluations thereof; and

(2) the evaluation of the effectiveness of federally assisted programs in which Indian adults may participate in achieving the purposes of such programs with respect to such adults.

(d) Applications for a grant under this section shall be submitted at such time, in such manner, and contain such information, and shall be consistent with such criteria, as may be established as requirements in regulations promulgated by the Commissioner. Such applications shall—

(1) set forth a statement describing the activities for which assistance is sought;

(2) provide for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the project in achieving its purposes and those of this section.

The Commissioner shall not approve an application for a grant under subsection (a) unless he is satisfied that such application, and any documents submitted with respect thereto, indicate that there has been adequate participation by the individuals to be served and tribal communities in the planning and development of the project, and that there will be such a participation in the operation and evaluation of the project. In approving applications under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall give priority to applications from Indian educational agencies, organizations, and institutions.



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

[illegible] For the purpose of making grants under this section there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and $8,000,000 for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to October 1, 1983.

Sec. 317 Repealed

*Adult Education Program for Adult Immigrants*

Sec. 318. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into grants and contracts with State and local education agencies and other public or private nonprofit agencies, organizations, or institutions to provide programs of adult education and adult basic education to immigrant adults in need of such services. Such grants and contracts may be used for—

(1) programs of instruction of adult immigrants in basic reading, mathematics, development and enhancement of necessary skills, and promotion of literacy among adult immigrants for the purpose of enabling them to become productive members of American society;

(2) administrative costs of planning and operating such programs of instruction;

(3) educational support services which meet the need of adult immigrants including but not limited to guidance and counseling with regard to educational, career, and employment opportunities; and

(4) special projects designed to operate in conjunction with existing Federal and non-Federal programs and activities to develop occupational and related skills for individuals, particularly programs authorized under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 or under the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

(b)(1) Any applicant for a grant or contract under this section shall first submit its application to the State educational agency.



BEST COPY

COMMENTS

The State educational agency shall additionally review and make recommendations to the Commissioner regarding the quality of each such application, consistent with the purposes of section 308(b) (12) and (13) of this title. A copy of the recommendations made by the State educational agency shall be simultaneously submitted to the applicant.

(3) Any applicant which has submitted an application in accordance with paragraph (1) of this subsection, which is dissatisfied with the action of the appropriate State educational agency may petition the Commissioner to request further consideration by the Commissioner of such application.

(c) Applications for a grant or contract under this section shall be submitted at such time, in such manner, and contain such information as the Commissioner may reasonably require.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 305 and 307(a), the Commissioner shall pay all the costs of applications approved by him under this section.

(e) Not less than 50 per centum of the funds appropriated under this section shall be used by the Commissioner to enter into contracts with private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions.

(f) For the purposes of making grants and entering into contracts under this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1979 and each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

*Legislative History*

P.L. 89-750, Nov. 3, 1966, Title III, 80 Stat. 1195;
P.L. 90-247, Jan. 2, 1968, Title V, 81 Stat. 813;
P.L. 90-576, Oct. 16, 1968, 82 Stat. 1092;
P.L. 91-230, April 13, 1970, Title III, 84 Stat. 186;
P.L. 91-600, Dec. 30, 1970, 84 Stat. 1660;
P.L. 92-318, June 23, 1972, 86 Stat. 342;
P.L. 93-29, May 3, 1973, 87 Stat. 80;
P.L. 93-380, Aug. 21, 1974, Title VI, Part A, 88 Stat. 578;
P.L. 94-482, Sept. 30, 1976, Title III;
P.L. 94-482, Oct. 12, 1976, Title III;
P.L. 95-112, Sept. 24, 1977, 91 Stat. 911; and
P.L. 95-561, Nov. 1, 1978, Title XIII, Part A.
P.L. 97-35, Aug. 13, 1981



BEST COPY

**STATEMENT OF PATRIC DORSEY, COUNCIL MEMBER, ACCOMPANIED BY RICHARD VENTURA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ADULT EDUCATION**

Ms. DORSEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Patric Dorsey, from North Carolina. I am chairman of the Governmental Relations and Legislation Committee of the National Advisory Council on Adult Education. With me today is Mr. Rick Ventura, executive director of the council.

We appreciate the opportunity to represent the council and to present testimony on the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. My comments will be brief and, I hope, to the point.

The council has devoted considerable time and effort toward a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the Adult Education Act. Numerous site visitations and countless conversations with adult educators, administrators, and students over the past 3 years have familiarized the council with the programmatic impact of the existing legislation.

In preparation of this testimony, the council scheduled nationwide nine hearings on the reauthorization of the act. Approximately 200 knowledgeable witnesses testified before the council at these hearings. The council has considered the points raised in both formal testimony and informal conversation. We have analyzed and debated the merits of those points. On the basis of the deliberations, we have developed the following recommendations which I respectfully submit for consideration.

The council strongly urges the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. To this end, the council has developed the following recommendations which embody changes of two types. The first category reflects changes of a technical nature or changes designed to enhance clarity, to simplify the language of the act and to emphasize basic educational opportunities and skills.

For example, all reference in the act to "the Commissioner" will be changed to "Secretary".

Now the second category includes changes of a more substantive nature. During the several national hearings conducted by the council, the designation of special populations within the act was commented upon with great frequency. Nearly 80 percent of those commenting on special population call for the elimination from the act. Specifically, the vast majority of adult educators with whom we spoke regarding this issue strongly advocated the elimination of references to "special populations". The council therefore recommends that specific references to designated populations be eliminated.

Three arguments were consistently advanced by those commenting on this issue. (A) The existing legislation is intended to serve all adults 16 years of age or older who have neither a high school degree or its equivalency and are no longer in school or required to be in school; (B) the needs of special groups can be addressed through individual State plans; (C) references to special populations frequently result in duplication of effort.

As currently written, references to special population include section 311, special projects of the elderly; section 316, improvement of educational opportunities for adult Indians; section 318,

adult education programs for adult immigrants. Section 306, part b(11) of the act requires that:

> Special assistance be given to the needs of persons with limited English proficiency by providing a bilingual adult education program of instruction in English, and to the extent necessary, to allow such persons to progress effectively through the adult education program in the native language of such persons.

As presently written, the act results in program cost increases in direct proportion to the number of different nationalities in a community. Virtually all of those who addressed this issue to the council cited the lack of qualified instructors in several languages as an additional obstacle to satisfying the bilingual requirement.

It is the council's recommendation that all references in the act to "bilingual education" be eliminated and replaced with reference to "instruction in English as a second language" or "English for speakers of other languages". Classes conducted in English as a second language have consistently met the needs of those adult students not conversant in English, yet desirous of developing the literacy skills necessary to progress effectively through adult education programs.

In the opinion of the council, such a change would not only be endorsed by an overwhelming majority of adult educators, but would more accurately reflect the educational and programmatic requirements of individual communities.

With respect to section 307, payments, the council recommends an increase in the State share of expenditures from 10 percent to 20 percent of the total and a decrease in the Federal share from 90 percent to 80 percent of total expenditures. The council forwards this recommendation with an understanding that such an increase in State expenditures would occur gradually over a specified period of time, perhaps 3 to 5 years, and that a State's requirement to maintain effort be retained.

Section 309, research, development, dessimination evaluation and information clearinghouse, has consistently received significant attention by those commenting to the council. In our opinion, there is an overwhelming need for the Department of Education to develop uniform, standardized reporting procedures for the Adult Education Program data from States. The great majority of adult educators and administrators insist that the collection of standardized data is not a burden. On the contrary, the collection of standardized data assists the states in evaluating program effectiveness.

Regarding section 312, State advisory council, the council finds the existing language unnecessarily proscriptive. In order to reduce the restrictive nature of the existing legislation and to encourage flexibility at the State level, the council recommends the elimination of the majority of this section as well as a rewording of part b(2) to read, "Such a State advisory council shall advise the State agency to carry out the responsibility of the act."

At this point, the council has included with its testimony a copy of the existing legislation with specific notations reflecting the council's recommended changes.

With respect to section 313, the National Advisory council on Adult Education, the council recommends part b to be reworded to read:

The council shall consist of 15 members, a majority of whom shall be comprised of persons knowledgeable in business, industry and other endeavors in which adults are gainfully employed. Such council shall include persons knowledgeable in the field of education, state and local school officials and other persons having special knowledge and experience or qualifications with respect to adult education.

The council bases this recommended rewording on a sincere desire to ensure the broadening of the council membership beyond the educational community.

Lastly, the council recommends under section 315, appropriations authorized, that, "Such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding year of the life of the reauthorized act be reauthorized to be appropriated."

Although I have not commented on all of the council's recommended changes, I would direct to your attention the copy of the existing legislation with all of the council's recommendations clearly outlined, which has been included with the testimony.

In developing these recommendations, it has been the intention of the council to assure the integrity of the act and to promote the most efficient utilization of Federal resources.

That concludes our testimony. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Andrews, go ahead.

Mr. ANDREWS. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't know that I have any particular questions. That's just a good, down-home, commonsense, in my opinion, set of recommendations and I hope that we will be able to implement all, or certainly most, of them.

Thank you for a very fine presentation. We are pleased to have someone from North Carolina on the National Advisory council for Adult Education.

Ms. DORSEY. Congressman Andrews, may I mention, too, that we have a very serious problem in our State of North Carolina with 1.5 million of our citizens being functional illiterates.

Mr. ANDREWS. Yes; and it surely can't be cured from up here, but I am pleased to have some part in hoping to be a part of a team that can cause that number to be reduced significantly. I think we can. I think we will. Thank you for your cooperation to that end. If ever you think I or we can be of additional assistance, please let us know.

Ms. DORSEY. Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess the first thing I should say is that in 10 years I have never seen testimony in which the panel has the bill and all of the suggested changes. That is very helpful. I have never seen that before. I guess I am suggesting that you give your friend to your left a raise in salary for doing this.

Ms. DORSEY. [Laughs.] I would gladly do that.

Mr. GOODLING. Just a couple of questions. I noticed that the administration does recommend changes, some of which I would think would be better not to consider since we do have a program that is working quite well. I would ask though—the one area—and I think Mr. Miller commented on it about the paid vendors coming into this business, for the sake of a better word—I couldn't find it here.

As I understand it, the purpose of that was that they see some isolated pockets somewhere that may not be able to be served simply because of the small number of people, who are there. My question, just looking at this beforehand, was, Is there some way we might be able to write something in the bill that if such pockets do exist we could word something that would allow a private vendor in that section to take care of them and, at the same time, not open up the entire program? As I understand the reasoning behind that recommendation, there may be some pockets out there that are not served, simply because of isolation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Goodling, I can only speak for the State of Ohio, because I am not sure about pockets that may exist in other States. We have 88 counties in Ohio. The program is available in all 88 and our problems with unserved really do not relate to a lack of an availability of providers, whether they be public schools or community colleges or technical schools and the like. Our problems basically—and I suspect that you would expect me to say this—relate to funding. We have programs with adults on waiting lists now. We have programs that cannot offer services on a year-round basis. They have had to close in March or April or May because of insufficient funds and yet the adult needs don't end in May. The problems of needs for education are year round.

We have some concerns that, given the low amount of funding in this program that exists already, the vast number of providers, whether they be schools or other public or private agencies—churches and the like—that the real need isn't for vendors. It is for the resources available to conduct the programs. I find it interesting that—I happen to be a great supporter of chapter 1 that this committee does such a good job in providing for—that we have more than a $3 billion effort in chapter 1, but we have a $100 million effort for the parents of the same children.

As a former school superintendent, I am sure you understand the importance of role models and parents, the vast amounts of research that relate to how people learn at what early ages and importance of the educational level in the family. I don't have a good suggestion for you as to how to work in the private vendor. I guess maybe I am not looking for one, in one sense. I think the problem is of another nature—of just the resources available with existing vendors.

In our own State it is constitutionally impossible for us to make grants to community-based organizations or to private vendors for this purpose. It would have to be on a subcontract basis. That might be something for you to look at in some States where it would be desirable——

Mr. GOODLING. You would still have control over it.

Mr. MILLER. Yes. We have some concerns about accountability and monitoring in this process, because this is a program that requires really careful administration to make sure that the maximum amount of dollars are spent on services to people. That is one of the beauties of the program. There are very few costs other than that which goes to the providing of instruction for students.

Mr. GOODLING. I might mention that when I have time, I would like to write some legislation that would do some combining of this adult education and chapter 1, simply because, as many people

here have heard me say before, when I was a school superintendent we used our chapter 1 money just for that purpose. We went out into the home to work with the 3- and 4-year-olds. But we were there primarily because we wanted to do something with the mother and father of those 3- and 4-year-olds. I would like to explore this area when I have the time.

Mr. MILLER. Well, I hope that would be soon, because when we did a survey of our chapter 1 program in one of our major cities, we found that out of the children who were coming to school that were having trouble reading, 72 percent of the parents were illiterate.

Mr. GOODLING. Well, our whole attempt was a reading readiness program in the home, realizing that we had to do something with that in mind.

How about the council?

Mr. VENTURA. Mr. Goodling, if I could comment on that question of profit and nonprofit. One of the concerns that the council had was brought to our attention by a number of the State directors of adult education. They pointed out to us that in some States—Arizona, for example—they don't have the same stringent requirements for accreditations of private agencies as they do for public agencies. That was a concern to us I guess what we would be saying at this point is that we would like to see a little more thorough investigation of the potential impact of opening up to for-profit agencies.

Mr. GOODLING. But if you said that the State, if they found such pockets of isolation, could contract out, then they would still have total control of how this would operate and, in all probability, wouldn't contract out unless they really had a problem somewhere.

Mr. VENTURA. That's true.

Mr. GOODLING. Did you wish to comment, Ms. Dorsey?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes; I would like to comment on the ESL Program, which is, of course, an easier and a faster way to get students to speak the language. But a doctor, Eleanor Thona, stated at the title IV Civil Rights Act Workshop in Phoenix, AZ this past February that in areas where there are so many different native languages, it would be financially impossible to have a bilingual program. She referred to a speech that she made here in the District of Columbia. Following the speech, several of the teachers came up to her and said that in their school district alone, there were over 40 different languages. In such a situation, as well as other programs, the English as a second language is much more feasible.

Mr. GOODLING. Well, I have used this argument also, because right across the Potomac, there are, I think, 70-some different languages in one school system and, in Chicago there are 100 and some different languages in one school district.

One other point or two. Most people indicate that we need better data collection. I think that is true. My question is, Do you have suggestions of how we do that without burdening you with all sorts of forms, et cetera?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Goodling, I think that the Department of Education has made some rather good efforts in this direction. Some of the most important things that happen as a result of this program are also the most difficult to measure. You can measure, of course, those who have become employed, those who leave public assist-

ance, those who register to vote for the first time, those who get driver's licenses.

It's hard to measure some of the more important things. As a former high school principal and also the director of an adult program, I can tell you that the children of these families became far less discipline problems, their attendance improved and, in many cases, their achievement improved in school because of the role model of their parents.

I don't know how you measure the impact on a family in which, literally, directions for children and adults are turned around. I would suggest that in a design of any information system that gets into followup, which is a particular area that we haven't done a very good job with, that whoever designs the system would involve practitioners—people who have been out on a day-to-day basis, who understand the reluctance that people have in giving information, the problems in getting the information and selecting out some priorities, what is really important to know about this program. There is a tendency to always ask more than we need to know. I would encourage the involvement of people from the field to sit down with the people who design to say, "This is what we believe is important and I think this is how we can find it out," and really set some high priorities and some limits on what is asked.

Mr. GOODLING. One last question. Mrs. Dorsey mentioned moving toward an 80–20. Mr. Miller, I think you were either silent on that issue or said, "Leave it where it is."

Mr. MILLER. I recommended we keep the match and certainly, we would not be opposed to moving to an 80–20. Most States are overmatching now. Before the committee would do that, I think you might want to do some study on the effects on some individual States. I don't have the data at hand in terms of individual States and what they contribute.

Ideally speaking, I think it might be interesting to even consider a match that over a 5-year period might move to a 50–50 basis.

Mr. GOODLING. I think there was testimony like that on the Senate side also.

Mr. MILLER. That's a good idea. I think you might want to do some study to see what the effects would be on some States who are having a particularly tough time economically.

Mr. GOODLING. So you are saying that we surely shouldn't go beyond 80–20 until we study the issue?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Ms. DORSEY. Well, we feel that the 80–20 does protect the States. This was recommended in much of the testimony that we heard. It was the maintenance of effort that was consistently being heard.

Mr. GOODLING. I noticed you said not to cap the administrative costs. I believe you said that, Mr. Miller, or you said to leave it where it is.

Mr. MILLER. Leave it where it is.

Mr. GOODLING. I noticed that, I think, it was New York that was the highest—they are at 7 percent and then next is Texas, which is around 6 percent, and then my State is 5.3 percent. We are always very concerned here about how much in any program goes into administration and how much actually gets down to the people.

Mr. MILLER. We won't be unhappy if you don't change it.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The testimony of both witnesses certainly clearly supports the reauthorization of the Adult Education Program and the recommendations they have made therein—deserves the study and scrutiny which I intend to give them.

I have just one question that stems primarily, I guess, from my curiosity, which is a part of the testimony of Mrs. Dorsey. That question is, I am just curious as to why you recommend in section 307 in regards to payment, the increase in the States' share of expenditures and a decrease by the same percentage in the Federal share. What is the reasoning behind that recommendation? It doesn't bother me. I am just curious.

Ms. DORSEY. Well, today, many of the States provide more than that 10 percent share.

Mr. HAYES. Some of the States are pretty financially strapped, you know, and are not doing what they should do in the total educational program right now and that sort of bothers me.

Mr. VENTURA. If I may comment on that also, Mr. Hayes. That was an interesting part of the testimony that we took in our nine hearings. That particular section, section 307, was commented upon probably most frequently. We were quite surprised that many of the State administrators who are actually involved in the program suggested, as some of the State directors did in testimony before the Senate this past Tuesday, that they would go as high as a 50–50 split between the States and the Federal Government. We felt that perhaps we were a little timid in suggesting 80–20, but we felt that it clearly reflected the testimony which we received.

Mr. MILLER. I understand your concerns, Mr. Hayes, because in our testimony we recommended staying with the 90–10 match, but I agree with the council's testimony in the sense that, given the large numbers of people that are unserved and given the fact that the Federal—I really don't think that it's realistic to expect the Federal funds to address the total question nationally, the answer has to be in increased State support and local support, if we are really going to deal with this problem in the massive way that we must.

So, philosophically speaking at least, any increases in State match that help move toward the kind of State support that is required—I think it would be a wonderful in this country if the school superintendent would look at his enrollment or her enrollment statistics and find out that the adult population equalled that of K–12. Indeed, that is already happening in some communities and I think it will be a glorious day when it happens across the board.

Mr. HAYES. No further questions or comments, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join everyone on this committee in complimenting you people on your testimony. It was, I think, very helpful and very, very good.

Generally, I want to begin with a question to Mrs. Dorsey. You really indicate that we ought to eliminate the reference to special populations. Would you then, in essence, support some of the ad-

ministration's recommendations in this area which seem to go more toward the block grant concept and toward giving the States more freedom?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes; we find that there is a great duplication in this section, because all of those special populations are already covered by the Labor Department and there are other areas that are already addressing that problem.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Miller, you made the same suggestion near the end of your testimony that some of the references to the special groups could be eliminated?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; for the same reasons. They are already being served in the program and there is no special appropriation coming forth and so it's really unnecessary language. They are already eligible under the act.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Perhaps I am not totally well versed enough on the program to have a different perspective, but as I look at the administration's proposal and I look at the set-asides—10 percent for demonstration projects, 20 percent for high school equivalency, 20 percent for institutionalized—it seems to me that adult education needs would vary significantly from State to State and that there would be some merit in, frankly, eliminating the specific set asides. We would amend the purpose to indicate that, clearly, these were the type of programs to which the act was directed.

I would be interested in the reactions of all three of you to that concept—to give Ohio or North Carolina or any other State the flexibility of deciding who most needs the adult basic education in their State, as long as you understand the purpose of this program extends beyond just dealing with demonstration projects or the institutionalized or the high school equivalency goal.

Ms. DORSEY. We have stressed basic education and, of course, adult education is to provide programs which will enable adults to acquire a basic academic skill that is necessary to function in society and to continue their education or their training.

Mr. GUNDERSON. OK. Let me just pursue that a bit. Does that mean that as long as we do that you are supportive of flexibility?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes. Of course, not every State has the same needs. There are, in some States, a greater number of the population that needs a specific type of program.

Mr. VENTURA. If I may comment on that also. I think we are very supportive of State flexibility as long as there is assurance in the act that the focus of the legislation would still be directed toward adult basic education. The individual who reads at or below the sixth-grade level, for example, that would be our primary concern that that individual is the one who is being served most specifically.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Gunderson, I find it interesting that the administration proposes, and rightfully so, to keep the 20-percent cap on GED. I think that's done for the specific reason to prevent what has been known over the years as the creaming effect, of taking those students into the program who are the easiest to recruit. The truly functional illiterate who comes back to school to learn to read and write for the first time, whether it be at 30 years of age or 40 years of age, poses some very interesting kinds of problems for a teacher in a program. It takes time and money and they are often

difficult to recruit because of age, because of embarrassment, because of fear, because of reliance on street language. By that, I mean, for example, in one of our programs where we wanted to bring young girls back into a program with a combination of ABE and secretarial studies, they quickly informed us they could make more on the street in 2 nights than they could in 2 weeks secretarial pay. That was an obstacle in getting some young folks back into the program.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I don't quite know how we can solve that problem.

Mr. MILLER. I don't know either. [Laughter.]

But I can tell you, by removing the cap on the GED, there is a tendency to take those people who are easiest to reach. We agree with the administration's proposal to remove the 10-percent mandate for special demonstration. We believe that the 5-percent cap is fair administratively and we believe that the 20-percent cap, which is not a mandatory set-aside—it just simply says that you can spend up to that limit—currently, again, the national statistics from the Department of Education say that 4 percent is being spent for that purpose. So, it's not a limiting factor.

We have a lot of flexibility. I have had responsibility for this program in Ohio for 19 years and we have a lot of flexibility in where we put the money. We really do. This is a good, basic program.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you all. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Nielson.

Mr. NIELSON. Mr. Miller, I would like to ask a couple of questions. I appreciate your testimony. It seems to be well thought out. I find myself agreeing with more than I disagree with on your statement.

On the matching maintenance of effort required, I agree with your idea that you could discourage States from participating at all if we dropped that amendment. I think you are correct on that. I also like the comment that the States could do more. We hear from some colleagues, however, on this committee that the States are strapped and they would like to be relieved of their responsibility. It's refreshing to find both of you saying that the States can and should be participating more than they have in the past. I appreciate that comment.

On the 5-percent limitation on State administration, you don't believe that should be there because your feeling is that administration costs would get out of hand if we didn't have that cap. Is that right?

Mr. MILLER. I believe that it should be there.

Mr. NIELSON. It should be there. Now, how do you account for the States that Mr. Goodling mentioned—New York, Texas, and Pennsylvania—who are above that 5 percent? How do we take care of those States then in this case?

Mr. MILLER. Well, obviously, they are taking care of themselves already and I suspect they are doing it out of their own State budget.

Mr. NIELSON. Is that correct, Representative Goodling?

Mr. GOODLING. Anything above the 5 percent would come out of the State budget.

Mr. NIELSON. I agree with both of those statements. One, I guess, I disagree with is your private, for-profit organizations should be eligible to carry out programs under the act. You indicate that is repugnant to you because you feel that it would get a lot of money-hungry people into the program. What about places where the public schools and the public areas are not sufficient to take care of it?

Are there places where it might be more proper to go to the private source rather than set up a new public agency?

Mr. MILLER. I am certainly not advocating setting up new public agencies. I believe that—if I understand—in Ohio, it's not a problem, but in States where there may be pockets of unserved adults, there are local school boards in every community, there are usually community colleges or colleges or technical institutes or YMCA's or other nonprofit agencies available. I believe that there are proper agencies for those folks to appeal to for service and there is a State education agency which has the responsibility under the law to see that services are provided.

I believe that that is the responsibility of people like myself and others to make darn sure it happens.

Mr. NIELSON. If there were such cases where there are underserved populations because there are no public agencies available, and if the bill were confined to that particular case—it spelled out that it had to be just in those cases—would you oppose it—if there were no other way to take care of them?

Mr. MILLER. Probably not. If it were carefully, carefully defined that all other alternatives were x-ed out.

Mr. NIELSON. Fine. Now the one that I think is the most controversial is this 5-percent set-aside that the Secretary be permitted to set up. I tend to agree with you. I don't think that the 5 percent should be deleted and I think that should be handled separately. But if it were in the bill, do you think the greatest attention should be given to the choice of the State or should the Secretary make that decision?

Mr. MILLER. Now, Mr. Nielson, in the past when the Secretary did have some available money, there was funded at the University of Texas what was called the APL project, the adult performance level project, which probably caused more attention to be focused on the problems of adult illiteracy than any single project of its kind in this country for some time. That was a determination made by the Secretary and I think that that money should not be allocated on a State-by-State basis, but carefully established priorities should be determined. There should be a panel of people representing broad interests in adult education that would serve as folks who would recommend proposals and that such proposals from the Secretary's Office should be national in scope and address national issues, particularly in relation to data collection, followup on students, unserved needs and promotion of the program.

Mr. NIELSON. You don't feel that the Congress should be setting those ways to spend that 5 percent then?

Mr. MILLER. I would hope that you would have something to say as to what some of the national priorities should be.

Mr. NIELSON. Should be.

Mr. MILLER. Not the final say.

Mr. NIELSON. Not as to specifics.

OK. Let me ask another question. The 20-percent cap on institutional adults. Your fear is that if we don't have that cap, some States may spend it all on the institutional group and will not go to the other deserving adults. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIELSON. Do you concur with that, Ms. Dorsey?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes; I do.

Mr. NIELSON. And yet, there is no indication that any State has done that in the past, even approached the 20 percent. Why shouldn't the cap be dropped maybe to 10 percent since no one goes over 4 or 5? Why shouldn't we go the other way?

Mr. MILLER. I would have no particular objection to that.

I think that there are folks, representing particularly the departments of corrections that might have some feelings about that, because 4 percent represents a national figure and in some States it may exceed that. I think you would have to take a look at the individual State reports and take a hard look at the ratios within those given States because you might be seriously affecting a given State program that might be spending 20 percent on institutionalized adults. I don't want to downgrade the importance of serving folks, particularly in the correctional institutions, because our data shows that 75 to 80 percent of those folks are undereducated and one of the reasons they are in there is because of a lack of education. I think the 20 percent seems to work well. You could give some consideration to 10, but you would want to check individual States and see what effect it would have.

Mr. NIELSON. Ms. Dorsey, would you indicate how you plan to coordinate the adult education with the JTPA Act, which is just recently underway? How would you do that? Perhaps Mr. Ventura would have some comments also.

Ms. DORSEY. Congressman Nielson, that's up to the individual States how they coordinate the program.

Mr. NIELSON. What would your recommendation be?

Mr. VENTURA. Well, one of the things that we would like to see is greater participation on the part of the adult education community, whether they are on the PIC's or whatever. So often we see, going from State to State, that the adult educators have historically been reticent or reluctant to take an active role in agencies such as a PIC. We would just encourage them to participate in that.

Mr. NIELSON. Let me ask Ms. Dorsey two other questions. Do you believe the emphasis should be placed on the least educated in your adult group—the functionally illiterate—rather than the general run of people who want to go back to school for some other reason?

Ms. DORSEY. Absolutely. Adult functional illiteracy is a major problem in the United States today.

Mr. NIELSON. And in view of the question of the variety of ages—you mentioned 16 and over—does the program presently have enough flexibility to take care of the young dropouts as well as the older ones returning for more work?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes; we believe that it does. It's a conservative estimate that 2.3 million join that pool of illiterates every year. So clearly, it is a problem that we are going to have to address.

Mr. NIELSON. The thing I found most interesting about your comments, Ms Dorsey, was your reference to bilingual education.

Ms. DORSEY. Yes.

Mr. NIELSON. I am a cosponsor of a bill to allow States the flexibility of using bilingual funds for either bilingual or the immersion program or English as a second language. We have been trying to give the States this flexibility. Some States want it. Some do not. You seem to be in the former category that there are other ways to get people to learn English other than bilingual. Is that correct?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes; and that's the easiest way, because ultimately, what they want to do is be conversant in the English language. In this country they are all desirous of speaking English and that is the most immediate way.

Mr. NIELSON. Mr. Miller, would you like to add to that?

Mr. MILLER. The end result desired is the ability to compete in the job market, which requires an English skill. A true bilingual program is one very good way to help adults. The problem is, for example, in an adult program where you may have 17—I am not making something up—in one of our adult programs, we had actually 17 languages in one program and the teacher spoke 4—it's impossible for us to find the people in a State like Ohio where we really don't have any teacher education programs which produce bilingually trained teachers to come up with a staff. There are many other approaches. We prefer to call ours "English as a second language." By using peers as tutors, by using folks in the community as teacher aides who are fluent in a language, we can address some of the bilingual needs. But a strict bilingual program really won't work in this particular area.

Mr. VENTURA. If I may comment on that also. I visited a program in Oakland, CA, where in one class they had 40 different languages. Also in our testimony—we took testimony from 200 people—63 percent of those who commented, commented on this particular subject of bilingual education. Of those people, only one person was in support of retaining references to "bilingual education". Overwhelmingly, 99 percent of those who testified were in favor of deleting that language.

Mr. NIELSON. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment Mr. Miller and Ms. Dorsey and Mr. Ventura for what I consider to be the best constructive suggestions we have heard on any bill before the committee up to this point. As Mr. Goodling indicated, the chapter and verse approach of Ms. Dorsey and also the very constructive suggestions here, are going to be very helpful. I am confident that whether it be the omnibus vehicle that Mr. Perkins suggested or a separate bill focusing on adult education as such, that these will be very helpful in drafting a good bill.

I thank them and congratulate them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to compliment the witnesses and just say maybe facetiously, but in part serious, I just wonder who could go into a group of people where 40 languages were being spoken and in fact know how many were being spoken. I don't know how they would know enough about each language to differentiate between them sufficiently to say there were 40. I just can't imagine who would have that much competence.

Mr. VENTURA. Well, this was in a program in Oakland, CA. They had a number of Indochinese refugees. Many of the languages, I assume, were, in fact, dialects.

Mr. ANDREWS. But how would you know—how would you differentiate this dialect from that one in order to determine that there were, in fact, 40 as opposed to 50 or 30?

Mr. VENTURA. I don't have the slightest idea. That's just what the instructor told me.

Mr. GOODLING. Sure would make interesting prayers. [Laughter.]

Ms. DORSEY. I would just like to——

Mr. ANDREWS. May I say one other word? I chair one of the subcommittees of this committee and recently we have been preparing to try to get a reauthorization of the Head Start and Follow-Through Programs and I won't divert to that but just for a second.

I just have the feeling that as to that 1.5 million, Ms. Dorsey, in North Carolina and similarly elsewhere, that in another generation, various programs—we are all functionaries, I guess and that happens to be an area that I am interested in—but the information we have is that we need to prepare these people who come from the families and who have the handicaps physically or lack of motivation or social background that does not really equip them to enter first grade and to probably to be able to sustain themselves from class to class and, hence, they become the typical dropouts and, I imagine, are likely to wind up among those statistics—the 1.5 million—who are illiterate. I feel that this program is a good one, but I just would emphasize that I think there are many programs that I think we need to continue and support that will have a combined effect of accomplishing a tremendous lot in another generation. I just happen to feel that Head Start and Follow-Through, with which you may or may not be very familiar—it's not part really of the school system—I think they are having a lot of good impact for various reasons. One of the accomplishments, I think, relates to the problem of illiterate adults and I think it will make an impact in time toward a reduction of that number.

Mr. GOODLING. As chairman of the subcommittee, may I suggest that you change that name "Head Start"? It really isn't a head start at all; it's trying to give them an equal start and I think we ought to call it "Equal Start." Head Start, to some school board members means that you are going to get those kids ahead of their kids.

Mr. ANDREWS. I never thought about it before. Thank you.

Mr. GOODLING. If you call it "Equal Start," they are more supportive.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think that's a good suggestion. I never thought of that.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you, Mr. Miller and you, too, Ms. Dorsey, if either of you have any data on the effectiveness of adult education programs in terms of increased earnings for participants and the percentage of participants achieving various educational levels? Go ahead first, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Last year alone public assistance cost Ohio taxpayers $6 million and for those adults who enrolled in the ABE Program and left public assistance, to the taxpayers of Ohio, that meant a savings of $6,054,000. Our Federal grant was a little over

$4 million. In addition to that, in terms of the people who became employed—and we computed this on a minimum wage so we could not be accused of padding the data. I know that many of them that became employed had jobs that paid above the minimum wage. But computing minimum wage alone, the income generated was in excess of $16,700,000. We made no attempt to compute the income taxes, State, Federal or local generated from those figures because of some of the obvious difficulties in determining that. But that's a lot of money to put back into the Ohio economy and the savings to public assistance in our State were substantial. It's a program that more than pays for itself just in hard dollar terms. I believe that is a similar problem to be found in every State in the Union.

Chairman PERKINS. In other words, the program is returning $5 for every $1 spent.

Mr. MILLER. It's a good return. I think that's a safe estimate.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you agree with that, Ms. Dorsey?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes; I do. Mr. Chairman, we do have data and we would be happy to supply you with it. We did not bring it today. I have some statistics——

Chairman PERKINS. Without objection, you supply them and they will be inserted in the record.

Ms. DORSEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. It's very pertinent because that question nearly always arises on the floor.

Now, one additional question. We always hear the question about funding. I am wondering if the present $100 million appropriation is adequate for adult basic education to bring these adults up to a high school equivalency. You address that question first, Mr. Miller, and then Ms. Dorsey.

Mr. MILLER. As I said before, when we are spending $3 billion a year to help disadvantaged kids learn under chapter 1 and we are spending $100 million on their parents, to me, the comparison and the adequacy is opposite. I wish I could give you a solid figure that would represent what it would really take to address this problem nationwide. But $100 million is woefully inadequate.

If you asked me, "What could you do with additional money," it would be to hire full-time teachers; it would be to keep centers open day and night; it would be to open centers on a year-round basis, sometimes on Saturday and perhaps on Sunday at a time when people can come; to provide supportive services and guidance and counseling that's important; to provide placement services; to provide in-service training for teachers.

One of the programs that we operate is what we call a home instruction program, which you have in your State of Kentucky and it's a program that we are sometimes criticized for operating because of the cost. It's a program that involves teachers operating sort of like the old-time circuit preachers, who go out into the homes and work with adults. People say, "Why can't those folks come back into the centers?" Here we are talking about reaching the hardest to reach, folks who, for whatever reasons, will not leave their homes to come into centers and need that help before they can—and we are affecting kids—these home instruction teachers take materials with them to work with kids while they are in the home. That's a costly program. But the real question is, Can we

afford not to do it, because I could tell you in terms of the people we are reaching, it's the people that you had in mind when this legislation was enacted.

We could use much, much more money in a very productive way and I would submit that the program would continue to pay for itself if we had those funds.

Chairman PERKINS. All right. Do you want to comment on that, too, Ms. Dorsey?

Ms. DORSEY. Yes. In light of the Secretary's adult literacy initiative, we certainly feel that we would like to see an increase in funds, but we will leave that up to the wisdom of the Congress.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Goodling, any further questions?

Mr. GOODLING. No; thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Hayes, any further questions?

Mr. HAYES. No; thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me thank both of our distinguished witnesses this morning. You have been most helpful to the committee. In fact, I think this has been an excellent hearing record. You have contributed immensely to the hearing record. We hope to get this legislation underway. I have seen the program grow from scratch, and I agree with you people that it's a wonderful program.

The committee will now adjourn until the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee was recessed at 10:48 a.m., on Thursday, March 22, 1984, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Material submitted for inclusion in the record follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ALICE MCDONALD, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mr. Perkins, Chairman Simon, and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to present testimony regarding adult education. First of all I want you to know that I support what you have done for us and what you are now trying to do for the undereducated adults of this country through the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. I am deeply committed to the cause of adult education and intend my remarks today to focus on some positive suggestions about key elements of the proposed changes in the act.

I want to address my remarks today to adult literacy and, specifically, to a piece of legislation that deals exclusively with basic academic and life skills for adults—the Adult Education Act. I would also like to comment on a portion of a bill (H.R. 5240) concerning higher education that relates to adult literacy and using college work-study students to extend services offered to illiterate adults.

With 49 percent of Kentucky's adults age 25 and over not having a high school diploma and one-third of our adults in this age bracket having completed only 8 years of school, I am very aware of the value of adult education for Kentucky's citizens.

The Adult Education Act permits the Kentucky Department of Education to address this need through offering adult basic education opportunities in 110 counties. These programs operate through four types of instructional services for our sparsely populated rural counties as well as our densely populated urban areas.

The newest component in our delivery system uses volunteers to tutor illiterate adults individually with a minimum increase in funds. The program is based on the Jefferson County adult reading program developed through funds from the Adult Education Act, section 310. This program received funds through the Kentucky Department of Education and was named an exemplary program in education by the joint dissemination and review panel. We are very proud of the fact that this program received funds for national dissemination and has been implemented within the past year in over 250 counties and school districts throughout the country.

So in Kentucky, we have a severe need for basic skill instruction for adults, and we have developed high quality, successful programs to address those needs. These programs have not only succeeded in Kentucky but have been recognized as exemplary by others in the country.

The issues we can not combat, despite our success, are the decreases in funding in actual dollars which have occurred and the spiraling inflation rate which has resulted in the reduction in funds for our programs. These forces have worked together to actually make it impossible to serve as many students during last fiscal year as we were able to serve in fiscal year 1979 when program funds experienced their last substantial increase.

The need for adult education services has never been more critical as we are trying to combat illiteracy and retrain our adults for new vocational training. We must work to enable them to become employed and be removed from public assistance rolls.

I would urge you, Congressman Perkins, to reconsider the $106 million authorization level and raise it to a more realistic level of $140 million. Adult education could better serve the "least educated and most in need" in our country, and Kentucky in particular with this increase.

The adult education program in Kentucky is cost effective because it serves 23,000 adults at a cost per adult of $88. Cost breakdowns show that this economic investment more than pays for itself in public assistance savings and employment related income. Even though we can not say there is an exact cause and effect relationship between adult education instruction and economic improvement, high correlation exists.

In Kentucky last year a significant percentage of our unemployed students became employed, and many of our students receiving public assistance were removed from public assistance rolls. These figures resulted in an annual rate of return of 10.2 percent.

*Estimated dollars saved or returned*

| | |
|---|---|
| Public assistance savings | $769,284 |
| All taxes on new income (at minimum wage) | $1,468,856 |
| All taxes on increased income (average 10-cent hour) | $15,516 |
| Total saved | $2,253,656 |
| Dollars Invested | |
| Federal and State | $2,044,769 |
| New return for taxpayers | $208,887 |
| Annual rate of return (percent) | 10.2 |

The Kentucky Department of Education has a carefully devised data collection system. The system has resulted in this kind of information which vividly demonstrations the impact of Adult Education in Kentucky. I would support clarifying the authority of the secretary to request information from states about adult education students, programs, expenditures and goals as suggested in the proposed legislation. The detailed information compiled on Kentucky adult education students and programs allows us to demonstrate the tremendous impact of adult education on Kentucky's economic, social and educational climate. This data collection has also helped us to evaluate our programs and to refine our instruction and delivery systems, and I endorse this system.

In addition, I would strongly recommend that the information be studied for its appropriateness and usefulness. I would suggest that the secretary select a national task force of adult educators to make recommendations about the information and the instrument itself.

*Required expenditures.*—I support the proposed bill to delete the current requirements that states use at least 10 percent of their grants for teacher training and demonstration projects. This deletion would give Kentucky more flexibility in its expenditures of funds and enable us to make decisions based on our needs.

Nevertheless.—I still see the value of these activities in Kentucky because we have fully utilized the ten percent to provide staff training and to support the development of a model program for the Nation in adult literacy. I do support authorizing these activities but not mandating them.

On the contrary, I do not support the removal of the 20 percent maximum expenditure for programs serving institutionalized adults. I feel we need this ceiling to maintain accountability to all citizens of Kentucky who are in need of basic skills. The intent of the act is to help those individuals who are most in need and for whom no other resources are available.

*Matching and maintenance of effort.*—The proposal to eliminate matching and maintenance of effort requirements for states could have a detrimental effect on services offered to adults in Kentucky. The existing 10 percent matching requirement ensures that even in the most depressed budgets, state money is allocated for adult basic education. I support increasing the State match while acknowledging

that budget constraints in states like Kentucky may prohibit a consistently increased match each year. I support the maintenance of effort mandated for the States but suggest that the interpretation be examined. We are unrealistic to expect states to report all money if they are expected to maintain this dollar amount in the face of budget uncertainties.

Requiring matching monies and revising the mandate of the maintenance of effort for funding would help adult education in Kentucky and be more realistic with the prospect of restrictive state budgets.

*State administration.*—The pending legislation to delete the 5 percent limitation on state administration may cause some problems in Kentucky, and I would hesitate to support it. Historically, adult education has been a program of direct service; and with the current cap on administrative costs, Congress has ensured that serving undereducated adults is its top priority. Since the cap ensures low administrative costs, mandating a raise to possibly 6 to 8 percent would be an effective compromise.

*National programs.*—The proposed portion of the bill allowing the secretary to set aside up to 5 percent of the appropriation for national programs is certainly desirable, and I would support it with limitations. Our adult education appropriation is lean considering the Monumental task, and I would have to discourage any effort to further reduce this appropriation. At any rate, I would support a percentum for national programs if the appropriation were at least $125 million before that percentum were set aside.

In Kentucky, we have a big job to do in adult education. We have developed quality programs of instruction that work, and we have developed delivery systems that are efficient. We have expanded our resources through other sources of revenue and through fully utilized volunteers. We have stretched our resources to the breaking point and can not afford the luxury of 5 percent if it means longer waiting lists and reduction of services.

*Private for profit organizations.*—I am concerned about the proposed provision to allow for profit organizations to carry out programs under this act. When we have such limited resources and we already have established delivery systems which are working, I question the feasibility of encouraging organizations with no proven track record in adult education basic skills instruction to operate programs. A model program to test the feasibility of this approach may be a legitimate expenditure under the National Institute for Education (NIE) Literacy Initiative funds or the Secretary's discretionary moneys. This model may establish the proven validity of such an approach and would provide a basis for recommendations about programs administered by the private sector.

*Higher education literacy work-study students.*—The Adult Education Act provides the major legislation for services in adult basic education programs and targets its effort toward adults in need of literacy skills. Adult education programs have been fortunate to have a special emphasis placed on their programs by President Reagan's and Secretary Bell's adult literacy initiative that was announced in September of this year. One aspect of the initiative is the development of college work-study programs in adult literacy under the federal college work-study program.

I would like to comment on part B of the proposed H.R. 5240 as it relates to adult education literacy initiatives in Kentucky. We have vast experience in using volunteers for literacy instruction and support services for literacy programs. In addition, our National Diffusion Network (NDN) grant has resulted in our providing training for one of the 18 current demonstration sites in Houston, TX.

First, I would like to say that I support the effort to utilize college work-study students to help in the literacy effort. In Kentucky, we have used volunteers in our adult basic education literacy program for the past 5 years. Our success in developing a model has enabled us to replicate it in seven other States and in over 200 other counties or school districts. The model for training volunteers developed by the Kentucky Department of Education has been used to train over 2,000 volunteers just in the past year. These volunteers were able to teach an estimated 8,000 adults to read as a result of the training.

We are currently using college work-study students at Murray State University to aid in our adult literacy efforts. We see great potential for their service in the fight against illiteracy in Kentucky and throughout the country. I would support and encourage increased funding for use by colleges for work-study students assigned to adult literacy programs.

Because of our experience in the college work-study literacy program in Houston and our experiences with volunteer training and management, I would like to recommend maximizing the impact of this initiative on adult literacy by:

1. Encouraging colleges and universities to work with existing literacy programs to support and extend the services of adult basic education programs and/or local

literacy councils which have expertise in volunteer training, program management, and adult literacy instruction.

2. Providing resources in the college work-study program for materials, training, management and transportation to supplement the students' stipend or providing additional resources to the existing adult basic education programs. Paying students' stipend does not deliver literacy services, and cooperative efforts may have to be mandated to maximize resources and offer the best quality and service to illiterate adults.

3. Using college work-study students in a variety of roles to support literacy programs—not just as tutors. Administrative duties, recruitment efforts, public relations and volunteer management duties have proven to be viable roles for volunteers working in adult literacy programs.

Students who do work as tutors shoud be under immediate supervision of experienced adult educators or literacy coordinators. The recommended model would allow college work-study students to function more as a teacher aides in existing literacy programs. This method would encourage one-on-one tutoring and provide the security of a group as well as the resources of a trained staff person.

I am deeply concerned about providing a high quality program for the adults of Kentucky and feel that the efforts outlined in this proposed legislation will enable us to do that more effectively.

I appreciate your efforts for adult education. Your continued support allows us to provide learning opportunities to those adults in Kentucky who have an impossible task of coping with life because of their lack of basic education skills. We serve a population in which 9 out of 10 of our enrollers have the potential for 20 or more employable years. The Adult Education Act enables us to make those years fulfilling in terms of economics and, more importantly, in terms of the satisfaction of reaching human potential.

I encourage and appreciate the emphasis being placed on adult literacy and am particularly excited about the resources that could be provided for adult education through college work-study programs.

---

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DONALD G. GILL, ILLINOIS STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION

I want to state my support for the reauthorization of the Adult Education Act. This program is an important asset to Illinois education and has been instrumental in assisting many of our adults to not only complete their high school education, but in numerous cases to qualify for increased job responsibilities. Other adult education participants have pursued higher education objectives providing employment opportunities for which they would not have qualified if they had not participated in the federal adult education program.

Basically, I support the reauthorization of the Act in its present form. I have received a copy of H.R. 5390 as of April 26. I understand this bill may be offered in its entirety, or that some of its provisions may be offered as amendments to H.R. 11.

In Illinois during the 1982-83 school year, adult education centers had a waiting list of 64,000 adults desiring the training provided by this federal program. Consequently, I was particularly encouraged by the increase in the authorization level to $140 million for adult education in Congressman Williams' amendments.

However, I do have some concerns with other specific amendments in H.R. 5390. These are listed including an alternative recommendation and rationale for your consideration.

1. Local administrative cost maximum of 8 percent.

*Recommendation.*—Let the state determine the maximum as allowed in the current Adult Education Act.

*Rationale.*—The areas of the state with the greatest need are often the same areas with fewest financial resources. In Illinois two examples include the Chicago Public School adult education program with approximately a 13.5 percent administrative cost in 1983, while East St. Louis had a 12.5 percent cost the same year. It is best for the state agency to determine its own state's needs and use its discretion to establish the local administration maximum.

2. Mandating a State Advisory Council.

*Recommendation.*—Allow for support of such a council without mandating it, as in the current Act.

*Rationale.*—Illinois is currently able to coordinate with vocational education and relevant constituencies by having a State Advisory Council on Adult, Vocational and Technical Education. Such an arrangement has meant a voice for adult educa-

tion and other relevant constituencies without the costs a separate, mandated council would require. Additional costs for a mandated advisory council would increase administrative costs which are currently strained due to previous reductions in adult education appropriations coupled with the increased costs of program administration. A 5 percent maximum for administration cannot support the additional costs of a mandated council.

3. Retaining a 5 percent maximum for state administration.

*Recommendation.*—Increase the maximum to 6 percent.

*Rationale.*—The proposed percentage for vocational education is 6 percent. The same is needed for adult education. While appropriations have actually decreased in the early eighties, the cost of services for the state office and staff salaries have increased. Should appropriations remain the same rather than equaling the authorization level, 5 percent will not meet current staffing and service needs. Further reductions in staff would mean a serious loss of service to local programs. Any further costs imposed by an advisory council and cumbersome mandated state plan review process would even further strain this area.

4. Proposed two year state plan with a mandated process for reviews by various agencies.

*Recommendation.*—A four year state plan is preferable. (I understand it may have been changed to four years.) The process for public imput should be left to the individual state as in the current Act.

*Rationale.*—A cumbersome mandated process would further strain the shortage of administrative funds that currently exists and make approval a more cumbersome process. Current law already requires participation by specified groups. The process for state plan approval should remain as in current law. Our state has a procedure for including public input. Further requirements are unnecessary.

---

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT WEDGEWORTH, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO, ILL.

I am Robert Wedgeworth, Executive Director of the American Library Association, a nonprofit educational organization of almost 40,000 librarians, library trustees, educators, and other friends of libraries. ALA strongly supports reauthorization of the Adult Education Act, and appreciates the opportunity to present a statement for the Subcommittee's hearing record on HR 11.

Although the promotion of access to information through literacy has been for many years a major priority of the American Library Association (ALA), in 1981, the ALA organized the Coalition for Literacy which brings together eleven national volunteer, private and public sector organizations with track records in working to promote a more literate population. The purpose of the Coalition is to conduct a three-year multimedia campaign that will inform the nation of the problem of illiteracy within the United States and to point to a solution of the problem on the local level. The media campaign will be designed to recruit and mobilize local voluntary resources to impact on adult functional illiteracy. There are three parts to the project:

1. A national public service advertising campaign conducted through the Advertising Council, Inc., designed to raise public awareness of the magnitude and cost of functional illiteracy and stimulate interest in local community responses. The Advertising Council has agreed to such a campaign, which would represent $30 to $50 million in free media space and time over a two-to-three-year period, provided that the Coalition can provide the necessary production funds and follow-up activity.

2. A telephone referral center to handle inquiries of all types, from requests for information on community programs to requests for help in student placement. This center will be operated by CONTACT, Inc., an organzation with experience in the literacy field and in operating of referral services.

3. Technical assistance and guidance to communities seeking to develop public or private literacy programs. This will be provided by Literacy Volunteers of America, Laubach Literacy International and professionals from librarianship and public adult education.

The Coalition for Literacy has chosen a multi-media campaign as a pivotal step in its program because the awareness and participation of the population has been cited by UNESCO studies as a vital factor to the success of programs to combat illiteracy. The Coalition wants to bring a higher level of visibility to the problem in the United States and mobilize activities toward solving the problem at the local level on a larger scale than currently exists.

Funds from the private and public sectors are being raised by the Coalition to conduct its program. The Coalition has already received grants from the Department of Education, B. Dalton Bookseller's and the General Electric Foundation. The expenditure of funds to cover out-of-pocket costs for the multi-media campaign will leverage a significant contribution in space and time from the communications industry, a commitment already received from the Advertising Council. Interest in adult illiteracy has also stimulated the development of a Business Council for Effective Literacy established by Harold W. McGraw, Jr. that will mobilize the business community to play a leading role in combatting adult functional illiteracy.

The Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) has fostered cooperative efforts by librarians, providing library based literacy programs in collaboration with the adult basic education or volunteer sector. Last fall, the California State Library initiated a California Literacy Campaign with $2.5 million in federal Library Services and Construction Act funds. The Campaign will encourage and support community-based adult literacy programs.

There are an estimated 2.5 million adult functional illiterates in California and 6 million adults who lack a high school diploma. The Adult Basic Education Program and the more than 350 voluntary-sector adult literacy programs in California lack the resources to reach such a large population. Community libraries will be urged to coordinate with adult education programs to avoid duplication. Many libraries are concentrating on those adults who need help but are unable or unwilling to participate in a more formal educational setting. The LSCA and Adult Education funds complement one another; both are needed as well as volunteer efforts and private sector support. However, LSCA is not the only supporter of library sponsored literacy programs.

The ALA supports Section 310 of the Adult Education Act under which some library literacy projects have been funded. This section sets aside at least ten percent of state allocations for special demonstration projects and training. This helps assure that states use a variety of approaches in tackling the sensitive problem of adult illiteracy. Adult literacy programs such as the one conducted by the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore, MD receives funds from both Sections 310 and 306 that pay adult basic education and GED instructor, purchase materials and provides funds for the in-service training of volunteer tutors.

Because libraries have traditionally collaborated with other community eductional agencies, the Coalition for Literacy was conceived by the ALA as a collaborative effort. The ALA is supportive of Section 306(b)(7) which requires that state plans describe the means by which the delivery of adult education services will be significantly expanded or broadened through the use of agencies, institutions, and organizations other than public school systems, such as libraries. The core of reaching the adult illiterate is through the use of expanded, flexible delivery systems that provide underlying support to adult basic education programs. The mobilization is a varity of community resources—human (volunteer tutors); physical (sites for learning e.g. libraries, churches, factories, etc.) and financial—is the primary objective of the Coalition for Literacy.

MEMBERS OF THE COALITION FOR LITERACY

American Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AAACE): A new organization formed in November 1982 through consolidation of the American Education Association (AEA) and the National Association of the Public and Continuing Adult Education (NAPACE). The organization serves 8,000 members through an annual national theme conference; publishing resource materials; and a legislative network offering position papers and testimony at highest levels.

American Association of Advertising Agencies (AAAA): A professional organization representing over 450 advertising agencies. The AAAA (or 4A's) sponsor many public service projects. In 1978, it adopted the literacy cause and focused on better information sharing among those involved and/or needing service. It has published a national guide listing all literacy programs and a monthly newsletter on literacy and has funded CONTACT, Inc. to provide information and referral services that links local and national literacy resources.

American Library Association (ALA): A national education organization, established in 1876, with 40,000 plus individual and organizational members. Because libraries serve as alternative education resources, they have been in the forefront of the literacy movement. In 1979 ALA received private foundation funds to train a group of librarians to train others (librarians and library trustees) in providing literacy programs in libraries. Both national Laubach Literacy International (LLI) and

Literacy Volunteers of America (LAVA) are official organizational affiliates of the American Library Association.

B. Dalton Bookseller: A retail bookstore chain operating 700 stores in 48 states with over 8,500 employees. B. Dalton contributed approximately $250,000 to libraries and literacy in 1982. In 1983 B. Dalton announced a $3 million commitment over five years to: (1) increase literacy through a grants program to volunteer community-based programs; (2) increase program effectiveness through technical service and (3) recruit other corporations in funding literacy program activities.

CONTACT, Inc.: An international human services information and referral agency (established in 1964) with a staff of 15 operating from Lincoln, NE. CONTACT handles national runaway and drug abuse programs. They implemented the literacy program sponsored by the AAAA.

International Reading Association (IRA): A 27 year old professional association of 60,000 plus international and national members with over 800 councils located in 65 countries. Members include reading specialists, researchers, consultants and teachers. IRA has as its purpose to improve the quality of reading instruction focusing mainly on grades K-12. Adult illiteracy is also advocated through IRA committee activities.

Laubach Literacy International (LLI): Organized more than 50 years ago, Laubach's "Each-One-Teach-One" concept became the core of the volunteer tutorial approach. LLI has more than 535 councils nationwide with 20,000 tutors providing basic English and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) tutorials for approximately 35,000 students. Laubach's publishing arm, The New Reader's Press, is internationally recognized for providing good skill building reading materials.

Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. (LVA): This 20-year-old organization has affiliates in more than twenty-six states with over 15,000 tutors providing tutorial programs in basic English and English as a Second Language (ESL) for approximately 17,000 students. LVA has strong programs in prisons, and in migrant camps besides those in urban and rural areas. LVA's publishing activities include high interest-basic reading materials in the humanities.

National Advisory Council on Adult Education (NACAE): A 15 member Council appointed by the President was established in 1970 by Congress to advise them on policy matters concerning the management of adult education. They also try to coordinate all federal programs offering adult education. Their charge includes review of program and administration effectiveness.

National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS): A permanent, independent agency within the Executive Branch, created in 1970, identifies the country's library and information needs; develops plans to meet them; advises the President and all levels of government on libraries. Members include the Librarian of Congress and 14 others appointed by the President with advice and consent of the Senate. NCLIS organized and conducted the 1979 White House Conference on Library and Information Services.

National Council of State Directors of Adult Education (NCSDAE): A council of 50 State Directors who implement the Adult Education Act. 2.4 million enrollees—1982—in adult basic education grades 1-8 and GED equivalency classes.

The work of the Coalition has already begun. The Coalitian's "800" telephone number responded to over 7,400 telephone calls in January 1984 as a result of a nation-wide television documentary on adult illiteracy and a televised appearance of Mrs. George Bush on behalf of the problem. Calls were from both people who wanted to volunteer and those who wanted to learn how to read. The reauthorization of the Adult Education Act is vitally important to the promotion of national adult literacy.

○